REY
GENE
HISTORICAL
SECTION

GEN

GENEALOGY
929.102
M56MMB
1881,
JUL-OCT

METHODIST

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

1881.

VOLUME LXIII.—FOURTH SERIES, VOLUME XXXIII.

D. D. WHEDON, LL.D., EDITOR.

NEW YORK:
PHILLIPS & HUNT.
CINCINNATI:
WALDEN & STOWE.
1881.

I 705367

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1881.

ART. I.—THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA.

Report upon the Customs District, Public Service, and Resources of Alaska Territory. By WILLIAM GOUVERNEUR MORRIS, Special Agent of Treasury Department.

The Native Races of the Pacific States of North America. By H. H. BANCROFT.

Contributions to North American Ethnology. By W. H. DALL. Issued by the Department of the Interior.

Alaska and its Resources. By W. H. DALL.

Travel and Adventure in the Territory of Alaska, and in Various Parts of the North Pacific. By FREDERICK WHYMPER.

Preliminary Report on the Population, Industry, and Resources of Alaska to the Census Office. By IVAN PETROFF, Esq.

Alaska and Missions of the North Pacific Coast. By Rev. S. JACKSON, D.D.

IT is now fourteen years since his majesty, the Emperor of all the Russias, in consideration of the sum of "seven million two hundred thousand dollars in gold," ceded to the United States of America the "territory and dominion" of Alaska. The geographical area included in this cession is vast, comprising more than 580,107 square miles, of which 548,901 miles are on the continent of America, and nearly 31,206 in the Aleutian, Kadiak, Behring Sea, Chugách, and Alexander Archipelagos. These are the dimensions of an empire.

Alaska is bounded on the east by British Columbia, on the west by Behring Sea. An air line, drawn across at its greatest breadth from east to west, would be 2,200 miles long. Another line drawn from the Arctic Sea, its northern boundary, to Attou Island, its southern extremity in the Pacific Ocean, would measure 1,400 miles. Its shore line, as ascertained by

the United States Coast Survey, including its bays and islands, measures 25,000 miles. Its entire area is "nearly equal to one sixth of the whole United States and Territories." The natives named it *Al-ák-shak*, or Al-áy-ek-sa, which signifies "a great country or continent." Alaska is an English corruption of its native designation.

The physical aspect of this broad domain is graphically described by Hubert H. Bancroft in the following paragraph:

Midway between Mount St. Elias and the Arctic sea-board rise three mountain chains. One, the Rocky Mountain range, crossing from the Yukon to the Mackenzie River, deflects southward, and, taking up its mighty line of march, throws a barrier between the east and the west, which extends throughout the entire length of the continent. Between the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific interposes another, called in Oregon the Cascade range, and in California the Sierra Nevada; while from the same starting-point the Alaskan range stretches out to the south-west along the Alaskan Peninsula, and breaks into fragments in the Aleutian Archipelago. Three noble streams — the Mackenzie, the Yukon, and the Kuskoquim, float the boats of the inland hyperboreans, and supply them with food. . . . The northern border of this territory is treeless; the southern shore, absorbing more warmth and moisture from the Japan current, is fringed with dense forests, while the interior, interspersed with hills and lakes and woods and grassy plains, during the short summer is clothed in luxuriant vegetation.

Perhaps no act of Secretary Seward's official life has been so severely and generally censured by the American public as his negotiation of the treaty by which Alaska was added to our territorial possessions. It has been ridiculed as "Seward's folly," and condemned as a bad bargain, by which valuable gold was given in return for a title to a vast but useless possession. Yet Mr. Seward never questioned the wisdom of his act, nor the value of the country purchased. And when asked, at the close of his public career, what he considered the most important act of his official life, he promptly replied, "The purchase of Alaska; but it may take two generations before the purchase is appreciated."

Those who know most of this "great country" concur in the judgment of Mr. Seward, with the single exception that, instead of requiring two generations to demonstrate its value, it will take but a short time to convince the public that its pur-

chase was a wise, politic, and profitable transaction. Mr. William H. Dall, one of the most scientific of its recent explorers, says of it: "We have bought for a nominal price the key to the North Pacific. It can no longer be said that three iron-clads can blockade our entire western coast. . . . The time may come when we shall call our Pacific fishermen to man our fleets, or the lumbermen of Alaska and our hardy northern trappers to don the blue and strike another blow for unity and freedom." Mr. William Gouverneur Morris, special agent of the Treasury Department in Alaska, says in his report that its best modern explorers have "demonstrated that Alaska is not the 'desert watery waste' hitherto supposed; but that, instead of being only fit for polar bears to live in, it has, if properly protected and nurtured by the government, a bright and useful future before it." To the same effect is the more recent statement of Ivan Petroff, Esq., special agent of the census, who, after making very extensive explorations, says, in his report to General F. A. Walker, "It thus becomes apparent that we possess in Alaska an immense area of land and sea, which, during the twelve years of our occupation, has impressed our people . . . that though, as far as we know, it does not invite emigration from our more favored States and Territories, yet there are still stored up in the recesses of its lonely coast and deep interior, resources which may prove of great value."

The opinions of these gentlemen do not rest on mere hearsay reports, but are deduced from personal observations and investigations covering the coast-line from Sitka to the delta of the majestic Yukon River, the greater part of the valley of the Yukon, and the Aleutian Islands. Their testimony justifies Mr. Seward, Senator Sumner, and other senators who voted for the purchase of Alaska, and proves, we think, that in this thing at least they were wiser than their generation.

The skepticism of the American public with respect to the value of this territory was, no doubt, largely founded on the idea that, if Alaska had been worth keeping, Russia would not have sold it. This at first sight seems plausible; nevertheless it may be true that a very thinly populated country, situated at a vast distance from the populous parts of Russia, and from the seat of its government, might for these reasons be so difficult for it to develop, as to be of little value to such a great

empire; yet that same territory, being near to the western portions of the United States, and accessible to their population by water, might be so easily developed as to be to them a desirable possession on economic grounds, provided that it possesses resources intrinsically valuable, and in sufficient abundance. And this appears to have been the actual condition of things. Russia, from 1779, when Catherine II. issued her first ukase subjecting the Aleuts to tribute, down to the date of the cession of Alaska, governed it through the agency and in the interests of the great fur companies, to which from time to time she granted charters. In one decade the fur company paid only $1,500,000 taxes into the imperial treasury, most, if not all of which, must have been required for the maintenance of the colonial officials. Being therefore of small economic value to its revenue, Russia could spare it without pecuniary loss.

If Russia had been as eager to push her conquests in America as she is to extend the area of her sovereignty in Europe and Asia, she would have had a political motive for retaining Alaska. But her policy is not to acquire any thing in America but the good-will of the people of the United States, she "being desirous," says the treaty, "of strengthening, if possible, the good understanding which exists" between the United States and the Emperor of all the Russias. Possibly this desire on the part of his Russian majesty arises out of his conviction that in the conflict for Asiatic ascendency, which is sure to take place sooner or later between Russia and England, the "good understanding" between him and the United States may be of great political value to him, and a serious disadvantage to his enemy. Here, then, is a diplomatic reason for selling us a territory which, owing to its character and geographical position, could add nothing either to the strength or wealth of Russia, notwithstanding it possesses resources from which we, on account of its contiguity to our Pacific States, may ultimately derive very great benefits.

Because the continental portions of Alaska lie principally between the parallel of fifty-four degrees and forty minutes north latitude and the Arctic Ocean, there is a widely prevalent opinion that its climate is too frigid to permit its settlement by white men. This, though a natural, is a false impression. It is true that a very large proportion of its interior is so cold as

to give no promise of ever being more than a vast breeding-place for fur-bearing animals, and a hunting-ground for the Indian nomad and the white trapper. But its coast, from Sitka to Behring Sea, has a climate which is as moderate as that of New York. As the Atlantic Gulf Stream modifies the climate of England, Ireland, and Western Europe, so an analogous stream, known as the Kurosiwo, or Japanese Gulf Stream, rises a little south of the island of Formosa, flows east of Japan, and then divides into two currents. One of these tropically heated streams enters Behring Sea; the other passes south of the Aleutian Islands, and ameliorates the climate of Southern Alaska to such a degree, that the annual temperature of Sitka, in latitude fifty-seven degrees, is higher than that of Ottawa, in latitude forty-five degrees, twenty-five minutes.* This warm current, which first strikes our continent near the mouth of the Columbia River in Oregon, sweeps along the coast line of Alaska westward until it reaches the peninsula of Aliaska, where it "bends back upon itself." West of that peninsula, and running north as far as Behring Strait, the other arm of the Gulf Stream modifies the climate, though in a lesser degree, as far north as the delta of the Yukon and Norton's Sound. Even Behring Strait is so much affected by it, that icebergs from the Polar Sea never pass through its waters.

But while this stream gives warmth to the sea-board of Alaska, it is also a cause of extreme humidity. Fog, sleet, and rain characterize the climate, and make it less agreeable than it would be if favored with a clearer atmosphere. As to its temperature, Dr. Dall, in his "Alaska and its Resources," says that at Sitka "the average of many years' observation places the mean *winter* temperature about thirty-three Fahrenheit, which is nearly that of Mannheim on the Rhine, and warmer than Munich, Vienna, or Berlin. The *maximum* temperature in 1868 was seventy-one degrees, the *minimum* eleven degrees. On the island of Unaláshka, in the Aleutian district, the average *maximum* for five years was seventy-seven degrees, *minimum* zero. Further north, at St. Michael's, on Norton's Sound, in latitude sixty-three degrees, twenty-eight minutes, the *mean* for the summer was fifty-three degrees, for the winter, eight degrees, six minutes. At Fort Yukon, in the interior, latitude

*See Dr. Lyell's "Report on the Geological Survey of Canada," 1875–76.

sixty-six degrees, thirty-four minutes, the *mean* for the summer was fifty-nine degrees, sixty-seven minutes, for the winter, twenty-three degrees, eighty minutes. These figures show great climatic differences, especially between the coast line and the interior. They also justify Mr. Dall in saying, "I have seen with surprise and regret that men whose forefathers wielded the ax in the forests of Maine, or gathered scanty crops on the granite hill-sides of Massachusetts, have seen fit to throw contempt and derision on the acquisition of a great territory far richer than that in which they themselves originated, principally on the ground that it is a 'cold' country. This complaint is but half-true, since on half of the coast of the new territory the thermometer was never known to fall below zero. Icebergs are unknown in Alaska from Dixon's Entrance to Behring Strait, and no polar bear ever came within a thousand miles of Sitka."

The *resources* of Alaska must be sought, not in its agricultural possibilities, but in its timber, fisheries, fur-producing animals, and mineral deposits. There is a quite general agreement among its explorers that it can never become an agricultural country. On account of its great humidity, not because of a generally barren soil, in no part of it can cereals be cultivated successfully, except perhaps on a few of the Aleutian Islands. Such vegetables as turnips, beets, carrots, radishes, salads, and cabbages have been grown with varying success from Sitka to the Yukon Valley. Potatoes have not done well, though the Russians say that the Aleuts have grown them from the beginning of the century. Grass is of fine quality and abundant every-where, except in the southern part of the district of Sitka, where the rugged mountains leave very few patches of land sufficiently level for cultivation. "There appears to be no doubt," says Dall, "that cattle may be advantageously kept in the Aleutian District," if properly treated. The same may be said of sheep. No trees bearing fruit fit for food have been found in Alaska, but its small fruits are numerous in variety, of excellent quality, and grow in profusion. The islands of Kadiak and Cook's Inlet are unquestionably the best agricultural portions in our new possessions.

In timber Alaska is very rich. It is found as far north as the Yukon Valley in abundance. In the Southern Sitkan Dis-

trict it grows in great profusion, covering the rugged, lofty mountains and valleys of the Alexander Archipelago, and also of the mainland to distances ranging from fifty to one hundred and fifty miles from its sea-board. The Aleutian Islands, however, are absolutely treeless. Though they are mountainous, and have a climate like Scotland, they produce no timber larger than a shrub. Mr. Petroff observes of the whole country that, "the timber of Alaska extends over a much larger area than a great many surmise. . . . The area thus clothed is very great." And this statement harmonizes with the testimony of Dall, Whymper, and all other intelligent explorers.

As to the *commercial* value of its timber there is a diversity of opinion. Petroff does not rate it very high, because, as he affirms, excepting the Yellow Cedar, which, in his opinion, is not very abundant, "the lumber sawed from it is not of the first quality." Mr. W. H. Seward, after visiting the country, said, "I venture to predict that the North Pacific coast will become a common ship-yard for the American continent, and, speedily, for the whole world." This was probably a somewhat optimistic statement. Nevertheless, it is largely borne out by the observations of Dr. Dall, who found, even in the Yukon Valley, an abundance of white spruce, (*Abies alba*,) a beautiful conifer growing from a height of from fifty to a hundred feet, "valuable for building purposes" and for "spars." He also found the birch (*Betula glandulosa*) very plentiful, and fitted to be put to "a multiplicity of uses." The black birch, poplars, willows, larches, alders, and junipers also abound in the Yukon Valley. The most valuable tree in the Sitkan district, and, indeed, on the entire Pacific coast, is the yellow cedar, (*C. Nutkœnsis Spach.*) The "noble thuja," (*T. excelsa*,) the Sitka spruce, (*Abies Sitkensis*,) the hemlock, and the balsam fir, are there also, but in what relative proportions cannot be determined until experienced lumbermen shall penetrate those dense unexplored forests. Then it may appear that the truth lies between the opposite opinions of Mr. Petroff and Mr. Seward.

The coasts and rivers of Alaska are so rich in fish that the accounts given by many witnesses read like fairy tales. There is, probably, no good reason for doubting that its salmon, cod, herring, halibut, clam, and perhaps mackerel fisheries, both as

to the numbers and quality of the fish, are equal to any and superior to most other fisheries in the world. When developed in a systematic manner, they must become a source of great wealth to such of our citizens as may hereafter become settlers in this distant territory.

Alaska has in the number and variety of its fur-bearing animals a sure source of wealth, provided their hunting be judiciously regulated. The fur-bearing seal (*Callorhinus ursinus*, Gray) and the sea-otter (*Enhydra marina*, Flem.) are marine animals. The former are taken principally on two small islands in Behring Sea, known as the Pribyloff Islands, and the latter in the waters adjacent to the Aleutian Islands. The fur seal was formerly found in many other parts, but the irrational greed of its captors has destroyed nearly all its "rookeries," except in the above-named islands, which are now the best sealing grounds in the world. The regulations enforced by our Government with respect to the number which may be annually captured are well fitted to maintain those islands as "a government stock farm from which it will derive, as it has derived, an annual revenue of $317,000, without diminution of the seals."

Besides these marine fur-bearing animals, Alaska contains the fox, marten, mink, beaver, otter, lynx, black bear, and wolverine. Upward of 40,000 skins of these fauna were known to be shipped from the country last year, besides an unknown number obtained by whalers.

Concerning the mineral riches of Alaska it is difficult to write with certainty, because there is so much contradictory testimony and so little has been done toward determining the question. It is claimed by some, apparently on good grounds, that coal, iron, copper, cinnabar, silver, and gold are abundant in many parts of the territory. But whether the coal is fit for use, or the precious metals are in quantity sufficient for profitable mining, is uncertain. Until our Government provides laws for securing titles to land this uncertainty must continue, inasmuch as capitalists are not likely to invest money in a soil to which they can gain no legal title. Why Congress does not give Alaska either a territorial government or attach it to Washington Territory, is a problem which many find impossible of solution on any principle creditable to its wisdom.

That the scattered locations of the natives and the difficulty of intercommunication between their widely separated villages make the problem a difficult one to solve must be conceded. Nevertheless, our people having become its owners, it would seem eminently just and proper that our legislators should place it under special laws and administrators suited to the condition of its population, and to the ascertainment, if not to the speedy development, of its resources, which may prove to be of incalculable value.

The most important question to the Christian philanthropist, with respect to Alaska, is the number, condition, and prospects of its population. Its material wealth is but as a fleck of foam in comparison with the moral and spiritual condition of its native population, and with the demand which its prospective settlement by emigrants from the States makes on the Christian Church to suitably provide for planting itself at such points as are best fitted for evangelizing work among both natives and settlers. That its vast fisheries and untrodden forests will, sooner or later, attract white settlers scarcely admits of doubt. That the grazing facilities in many of its islands will prove equally attractive to growers of cattle is, to say the least, highly probable. And should its mineral deposits prove equal to geological and other indications, it will very soon become our new El Dorado, to which thousands of men, stimulated by golden dreams, will be allured.

But whether emigrants shun or seek Alaska, the American Church should occupy its central points of population and trade. The debased condition of its native tribes calls loudly for the Christian missionary. By prompt response to this demand the Church would not only meet her obligation to preach Jesus to the native Alaskan, but she would also place herself in position to exert her influence on white emigrants, should they chance to rush thither. The philanthropist who recognizes the significant truth that "emigration tends to barbarism," will readily perceive that the Church owes it both to the native and to the emigrant to provide that Christian teaching without which the vices of the latter, mingling with the sensuality of the former, sink both into the depths of an almost irretrievable debasement.

The numbers of the native tribes in Alaska have been

variously estimated. The Russians, at the time of its transfer, claimed a population of about 66,000, of which about 3,000 were Creoles, or half-breeds, and Russians. General Halleck, in his report to the Secretary of War in 1869, makes the entire native population about 60,000. Mr. W. H. Dall, in his "North American Ethnology," estimates it as low as 26,813. These figures, added to the Creoles and whites, which he sets down as numbering 3,254, make the total population 29,097.

Mr. Dall's estimate, though differing so widely from the others, is confirmed by the partial census taken last year by Ivan Petroff, Esq., special agent of the Census Office, after extensive explorations, which required him to travel 8,700 miles by steamer, sailing vessel, and canoe. That gentleman's observations and inquiries, with some estimates for parts of the territory yet to be visited, led him to enumerate the natives at 28,103, the whites and Creoles at 2,075, making a total of 30,178 as the present aggregate population of the territory. It must not be forgotten, however, that a large portion of its interior remains unexplored by white men. Hence the estimates of the unknown region, though based on careful inquiries among the Indians on its border, must be accepted as somewhat uncertain quantities.

Of the 28,000 natives Mr. Petroff enumerates 2,214 Aleuts, 17,488 Innuits, or Esquimaux, and 8,401 Indians proper. The first inhabit the Aleutian Islands, which lie in the Pacific ocean along a curved line over a thousand miles in length, reaching from the south-western extremity of the peninsula of Aliaska almost to Asia. The second occupy the coast line from Mount St. Elias, in the North Pacific, and along Behring Sea, to the British boundary line in the Arctic Sea. The third, or Indians proper, are found in the part known as the Sitkan District, in south-eastern Alaska, and in the vast valleys of the interior, behind the limits of the Innuit villages. The varied character of these three divisions of the Alaskan people will be made apparent in the following condensed sketches. We begin with the most numerous body, the Innuits, or Esquimaux.

The Innuit of Alaska is a true Esquiman, though taller and more shapely than his brethren of the Arctic sea-coasts. He is five feet six or seven inches in height, possesses a "fair skin slightly Mongolian in complexion." His face is broad, his

cheek bones prominent, his mouth large, with full lips; his eyes, which are small and black, are set rather prominently in their sockets almost in a line with the bridge of his small and much-depressed nose. But in some of the Innuit tribes the nose is straight and prominent, and their members, if suitably dressed, might easily pass as Anglo-Saxons in the streets of our Eastern cities. The women are smaller than the males, and, while young, are often comely and attractive. Like the men, they have handsome feet and hands. Except around the trading-posts the Innuit of both sexes dresses in a coat called a "parka," which covers the body from the neck to the ankles, and is made either of the skin of the reindeer, the marmot, the mink, or the breast skins of birds. They wear trowsers made of either skin or cotton drill, and cover their feet with either moccasins or reindeer boots.

The Innuit house is an excavation covered with a mound of earth, having a small hole in its apex for the escape of smoke and the admission of light. Slender frames raised above the floor, and running round the interior, serve to hold the skins on which he sleeps. He makes the dog his beast of draught. He is both a hunter and a fisherman. He loves independence, is brave, light-hearted, talkative, fond of dancing, enjoys eating, raw or stewed, the flesh and blubber of the walrus, seal, and whale. He is hospitable, but will steal without compunction if he has the opportunity, though the sentiment of his people is opposed to more serious crimes. He has no laws, but public opinion favors the punishment of a murderer with death. He loves the vice of intoxication. His treatment of the old and infirm is cruel. Regarding them as useless, he often puts them to death. He burns the dead bodies of good men, buries those of women, and leaves the remains of bad men to rot or to be eaten by birds and beasts.

Like his Indian cousins, the Innuit believes in evil spirits, and in the power of the shâman, and is, therefore, much under his power. He has a vague notion of immortality, but no definite conception of rewards and punishments.

Russian influence over the Innuit tribes accomplished little or nothing toward their civilization. The Greek Church made but few converts among them. Perhaps its failure grew out of the hatred which the Innuit cherishes against the Russians

because of their former barbarities. Possibly, as Petroff suggests, its priests so misconceived the Innuit character as to make no impression upon it. And more probably, their preaching, being in word and not in spiritual power, could not reach either the consciences or hearts of these good-natured savages.

The Aleut is of smaller stature than the Innuit. Petroff says of him: "He wears the expression which we ascribe to the Mongolian race, to the Japanese more particularly. The hair is long, coarse, and black; the beard is scanty; the face broad; the cheek bones high and very prominent; the nose is insignificant and flattened; the eyes are black and small, set wide in the head under faintly marked eyebrows—just a suggestion of obliquity, and that is all; the lips are full, the mouth large, and the lower jaw square and prominent; the ears are small, and the skin a light yellowish brown." The women, though not handsome, are far from being repulsive. Except when on hunting excursions, and when about the village, at which times they wear the ancient waterproof garments made from the intestines of marine mammalia, the Aleuts dress in our modern style, their clothing stores being supplied by traders with goods from San Francisco. Not unfrequently the latest fashions may be seen adorning the persons of the belles of an Aleutian village.

The houses of these people, called barrabaras, were formerly half underground. Their walls were of earth, laid upon wooden frames, and from two to three feet thick. They were warm and comfortable if kept in good repair, albeit the air within them was close and foul. But the barrabara is now being rapidly replaced by the frame cottage of civilized society. The materials for their construction are procured at San Francisco by means of traders, who visit the islands to purchase the spoils of the Aleutian hunters.

The Aleutians are no longer idolaters. The Greek Church, which began its missions in Alaska in 1793, under the authority of a ukase issued by the reigning Russian empress, is established in all their islands. They are all nominally members of that communion; but, says Dall, "there is very little knowledge of the true principles of Christianity among them." Petroff confirms Dall, saying, "The piety of the Aleutian peo-

ple is very pronounced, so far as outward signs and professions go. They greet you with a blessing and a prayer for your health. They part from you murmuring a benediction. They never sit down to the table without invoking the blessing of God upon them. In a great many other respects down to trifling details, they carry the precepts and phraseology of the Church upon their lips incessantly." They have a place of worship in every settlement, and in two of their villages there are parish priests supported by funds supplied by the ecclesiastical authorities in Russia, and administered through the Greek Bishop of the Diocese of Alaska, whose residence is in San Francisco, but who, it is said, intends shortly to remove into the territory. The parish priests mentioned above make an annual tour among the islands to administer the sacraments and solemnize marriages. In the intervals the services of the churches are conducted by their local unordained officers. The only real apostle (Father Innocentius Veniaminoff) the Greek Church has ever had in Alaska established schools after his coming, in 1824, in all the Aleutian villages, by means of which large numbers learned to read and write Russian, and some their native tongue. But since his death the schools have been abandoned, and the children are mostly growing up untaught.

It is to be feared that notwithstanding their devotion to religious forms, the Aleutians are utterly ignorant of their spiritual meaning and ethical demands. Dall says: "They are greatly addicted to the use of snuff and liquor when they can obtain it. For the latter they would sell themselves as slaves, or dispose of all their property. . . . Crime is almost unknown among them, but there is a strong sensual element in their characters." Petroff confirms Dall. After speaking of their "improvident extravagance," he describes their habit of spending their surplus funds, at the close of a successful hunting season, in procuring a vile drink called kvass, inviting their friends, and drinking first to stupid intoxication, and then to "frenzied riots and a rumpus," during which they dance and howl, pull each other's hair, fight, and drive their wives and children from their houses into hiding places. By these excesses they destroy the comforts of their homes, and finally shatter their health and lose much of their skill as hunters. Nevertheless, while stating these facts, so demonstrative of the

worthlessness of the spiritual and ethical influence of the Greek Church, Mr. Petroff says, "It is idle to talk of the necessity of any new missionary work among these people!"

The *Indians* of Alaska in their general features resemble those of Oregon and British Columbia. Dall separates them into two principal *stocks*, the Thlinkets and the Tinneh, each of which is subdivided into several tribes. The Thlinket tribe, which inhabit Sitka Bay and the neighboring islands, he describes as having coarse black hair, small eyebrows, and fine large eyes:

> Their complexion is dark, teeth white and good, hands and feet soft and small; . . . they have generally adopted a style of dress somewhat civilized in appearance, and it is now impossible to find any of them dressed in their original style, which is quite forgotten. At present men and women wear much the same clothing. It consists of a long skirt or chemise, and a blanket, ornamented with buttons, which covers the whole body. . . . They all paint, and, while naturally not ugly, become fearfully so in consequence. Lampblack or vermilion mixed with oil is rubbed over the whole face, and the color is removed by small brushes, leaving patterns on the skin. . . . They perforate their noses, wearing a ring adorned with feathers. They make a succession of perforations all around the edge of the ears, which are ornamented with scarlet thread, sharks' teeth, or pieces of a shell. Each hole is usually the record of a deed performed, or a feast given by the person so adorned.

The Tinneh tribes, which inhabit the northern interior, all possess these general characteristics, varied by habits which climatic differences and their greater or less intercourse with Russian traders have contributed to form. Hence some of them—the Slâvè Indians, for example—are nomadic, moving from place to place. They have no permanent dwelling, and "live in skin tents throughout the year. Others, such as the Unakhotana, have settled villages, and build houses, though they leave them during the hunting season." Some of these tribes are quite intelligent, others are "very low in the scale of intelligence."

"Indian character, with some modifications, is the same every-where." Among some of the tribes theft is not considered a crime. Murder demands blood for blood. Licentiousness is universal; gambling is a prevailing vice. Polygamy is common among those tribes who are able to keep more than

one wife. Infanticide is often practiced, many mothers destroying their infant girls to save them from the intolerable hardships which fall to the lot of Indian women. They make slaves of captives taken in wars, which, however, are not frequent among them. They also obtain slaves by purchase, and the children of slaves are held in servitude. They do not believe, says Dall, in a Supreme Being, but in an obscure polytheism, which peoples the earth with multitudes of good and evil spirits. Out of this belief arises their faith in the shâmans, or sorcerers, who are supposed to have control of the spirits. In consequence of this superstition the shâmans exercise an authority over them which often amounts to chieftainship, albeit most of them are represented by Petroff and others as being "unmitigated scamps." The idea of transmigration of souls into other human bodies is common among the people.

Most of the Indian tribes cremate their dead, except the bodies of shâmans, which are inclosed in boxes set on four poles near the sea-shore. The remains of slaves are thrown into the sea. Slaves are not unfrequently killed as sacrifices to the *totems*, or caste symbols of the tribes.

The ethnology of the Alaskan and other American aborigines must, for the present, be regarded as an unsolved problem. Some ethnologists accept the theory of their Mongolian or Tartar origin. Their opinion, with its grounds, is summarized by Schoolcraft in his great work on the history of our Indian tribes, as follows. Referring to the Aleutian Islands, he says:

> The chain of islands connects the Continents of Europe and Asia at the most practicable points, and it begins precisely opposite to that part of the Asiatic coast north-east of the Chinese Empire, and quite above the Japanese groups, where we should expect the Mongolian and Tartar hordes to have been precipitated on their shores on the American side of the trajet extending south of the peninsula of Onalaska. There is evidence in the existing dialects of the tribes of their being of the same general group with the Toltec stock.

Professor Van Rhyn, in "Appleton's Cyclopædia," inclines to a theory very ably presented by Mr. Markham in the "Arctic Papers" of the London Geographical Society. He says, "It is probable that America was first peopled by Mon-

golians who entered over the N. N. E. point of Asia, and from whom the Arctics probably descend." But, in taking this view, Professor Rhyn does not wholly reject that of Schoolcraft, for he adds, "It is not unlikely that Polynesians also entered America from the west."

Mr. W. H. Dall, in his contributions to Indian ethnology, agrees with Dr. Rink, of England, in rejecting the theory of the original peopling of the American Continent by way of the Aleutian Islands, affirming that it is "totally indefensible." Concerning the Tartar, Japanese, or Chinese origin of the Innuit tribes, he declares that it finds no corroboration in their manners, dress, or language. Yet he considers it highly probable that, in the "far and distant past," the first population of America was derived from Asia by way of Behring Strait. After spreading southward and eastward, and developing into numerous stocks and tribes, it finally, by a reflex movement, occasioned by tribal wars, returned to the north-west. But the history of its intermediate migrations and of its varied development is hidden by mists so dense as to be at present impenetrable. Even the original identity of our Innuit and Indian tribes cannot be regarded as a question beyond dispute, although Mr. Dall asserts that "linguistically no ultimate distinction can be traced between the American Innuit and the American Indian." Future investigations by students of ethnology may or may not settle these interesting problems, but for the present it must be admitted, as Bancroft observes, that "their opinions are intrinsically not of much value, except as showing the different fancies of different men and times. Fancies I say, for modern scholars, with the aid of all the new revelations of science, do not appear in their investigations to arrive one whit nearer an indubitable conclusion."

But while their ethnological relations are uncertain, the fact that in this great land over which our flag now waves there are some thirty thousand souls in sore need of the Gospel is indubitable, and ought to startle the Christian conscience of the nation. That most of them are accessible is also certain. Their villages lie along the coasts and on the island shores from Sitka to the Yukon delta. That the Greek Church failed to evangelize them should not be accepted as proof that they can not be Christianized. That Church has a form of Christianity,

but possesses little of its power. Its missionary efforts, though partial failures, are, nevertheless, scathing rebukes to our American Churches. It did what it could; but these, with the praiseworthy exception of the Presbyterians, have hitherto refused even to try the effect of spiritual teaching on their fellow-countrymen in Alaska.

It is only four years since the Presbyterian missionary set his feet on the soil of Alaska. Yet his success goes far to prove that the Indians are eager to learn Christian truth, and susceptible to its regenerating power. Their desire for Christian instruction cannot be more impressively expressed than in the language of some of their representative men.

The following pregnant words were spoken by a Thlinket chief named Moses M'Donald at a meeting held by the Methodist mission at Fort Simpson, in British Columbia, across the border of Alaska. It was called to welcome a visit made by secretaries of the Presbyterian Board of Missions in 1879. Chief M'Donald said:

> We are glad that you are coming to help the poor people our neighbors, the Stickeens, (in Alaska.) When we heard of the great American nation—its large cities, its great business houses, its vast wealth and Churches—we were amazed that you did not do something for this people a long time ago.

In the same vein, yet with greater force, the Chief Toy-a-att said, at a public meeting in Fort Wrangell:

> . . . We have been told that the British government is a powerful one, and we have also been told that the American government is a more powerful one. We have been told that the President of the United States has control over all the people, both whites and Indians. We have been told how he came to be our great chief. He purchased this country from Russia, and in purchasing it he purchased us. We had no choice or say in change of masters. The change has been made, and we are content. All we ask is justice.
>
> We ask of our father at Washington that we be recognized as a people, inasmuch as he recognizes all other Indians in other portions of the United States.
>
> We ask that we be civilized, Christianized, and educated. Give us a chance, and we will show to the world that we can become peaceable citizens and good Christians. An effort has already been made by Christian friends to better our condition, and may God bless them in their work!

These cries from the mouths of heathens living under our own flag, from men whose conversion demonstrates the power of the Gospel to elevate and save their people, are unique in that they appeal not only to our Christian charity, but to our sense of justice. Our government is doing the aborigines of Alaska great wrong by neglecting its duties to a people over whom it claims rights of sovereignty. It is a burning shame, a blot on our national reputation, that there is no law in Alaska, no court of justice, no administration by which crime can be punished—nothing but our flag, our custom-houses, and a few revenue officers to collect an insignificant revenue from the fur trade. Surely that cry of the Indian chief for justice to himself and his fellow-Indians is grounded in righteousness. It ought to quicken our national pride of character, if not the public conscience, and inspire an irresistible demand from the American people that Congress shall throw the ægis of law over that great land and its thousands of ignorant heathen, many of whom are actually begging for the educational institutions which are the conditions of civilization.

The thoroughly evangelical character of the experience of the Indians, converted through the instrumentality of the Presbyterian missionaries, is delightfully illustrated in the following extracts from speeches made at a public entertainment they gave to those men of God. Toy-a-att, the chief mentioned above, said:

When I was young I was a great fighter; now I have learned from Christianity to fight no more. Christianity has changed us. Formerly we thought the crow made us, and made these mountains, . . . and every thing; now we know God made us, . . . made them all with his strong arm. . . . I have a Saviour. He died on the cross to save me. I believe on God. . . . When I die I know where I go. I go to God my Saviour. My heart is very happy now. I am in a bay where no wind; no wind now to upset my canoe and trouble me. I am in a safe harbor. The Lord is my light and peace.

Another chief, named Kadeshan, said:

You have heard how bad I was long ago. . . . I had a proud heart. . . . I do what devil tell me. How great the change now. Some one whisper in my ear and humble my heart to God. Formerly white men come here and blind our hearts. They learned us more badness. We knew no God in heaven, and they did not tell us. Then we hear a little about God at Fort Simpson, and

they tell us to pray God to send us a teacher. We then cry to God; we ask God, he answer our prayer. He never forget us while sinners. . . . See how kind God is. . . . See with your own eyes what God has done for us. . . . White men laugh at us because we Christians. We don't care; we not ashamed. They laugh against God, and cry down us. But we must strong our hearts, and not care for what they say.

A chief from Buffalo Island, named Hotchcox, visited a school of the Presbyterian Mission at Fort Wrangell, and while the tears streamed down his face, he placed his hand upon his heart and said: "Me much sick heart. You come teach all Stickeens, all Hydahs, all Tongas about God. My people all dark heart. Nobody tell them that Jesus died. By and by all my people die, (pointing down,) go down, down, dark."

The voices of these Alaskan chiefs, coming across the continent, ought not to fall on heedless ears. From the depths of their deep debasement they appeal to the charity of the American Church, begging for the missionary, the Bible, and the Church, that their people may become "peaceable citizens and good Christians." Thus far, though more than fourteen years have passed since they and their tribes became our fellow-countrymen, only one branch of the American Church has responded to their thrilling call. Who is to blame for this cruel indifference we will not pretend to decide. We incline to attribute it to want of thought, rather than to want of heart. Yet, when closely analyzed, what is want of thought but want of heart? Were our American Churches fully imbued with the missionary spirit, would they have suffered thirty thousand of their fellow-countrymen to remain a decade and a half in the depths of heathenish debasement, almost wholly unsupplied with the teachers and preachers which many of them are so earnestly longing to receive? Submitting this inquiry to the conscience of the Church, especially to that of our own branch, which, because of its circuit and itinerant system, is peculiarly fitted to work among a people living in small villages, scattered over a vast extent of country, we close this paper, with the hope that the condition of our missionary treasury will be such next autumn, as to justify our General Missionary Committee in making a favorable response to these pleading voices, which are still crying, "Come over into Alaska and help us!"

Art. II.—ARE INDIAN MISSIONS A FAILURE?

Allahabad Missionary Conference Report, 1872.
Bangalore Missionary Conference Report, 1879.
Indian Missionary Directory.
Lucknow Witness.

Various unfavorable opinions are expressed in India and out of it, concerning the thirty-one missions and over six hundred missionaries at work among the two hundred and forty million non-Christians throughout the empire, from the unqualified belief, coming down from the old East India Company, that they should be suppressed as endangering her majesty's government in the East, and the statement of the "Hindu Patriot," the organ of educated Bengal, that "missionary labors in India have practically come to a dead-lock, and our countrymen are not therefore particularly anxious about them," to the general commiseration and skeptical contempt and ridicule of the "Pioneer," re-echoed by the average Anglo-Indian and English-speaking *Babu* up and down the land, whose chief moral nourishment is Buckle's "History of Civilization" and the works of Theodore Parker.

It is the purpose of this paper, therefore, in order to furnish a plain, brief statement of facts, and correct such erroneous opinions, to notice, first, the direct progress of the Indian native Church, (1,) in numerical strength, and (2) in morals; second, the educational progress of missions in India, school statistics and influence, and the indirect influence of the missions of the land; and lastly, the assurance of their ultimate and complete success not only in the Indian Empire, but in the whole world.

I. Direct Progress of the Native Church.

1. *In Numerical Strength.*

(1.) Periodical Statistics. The statistics of the native Church have been taken from time to time, showing marked success in the efforts of missions to Christianize the land. In 1861 there were in the Protestant native Church, in the whole of India, 97 native ordained agents, 24,976 communicants, and 138,731 native Christians. In 1871 these had increased to 226, 52,816, and 224,258, respectively. In 1875 they had still further in-

creased to 311, 68,689, and 266,391. The general statistics, so far as taken in 1878, revealed 350,000 native Christians, and such has been the remarkable progress during the last two years, especially among the aboriginal tribes of South India, that it is almost certain that when the statistics are taken in 1881 it will be found that there are 500,000 native Christians belonging to the Protestant missions of the land. The Roman Catholics claim above 1,000,000 souls as belonging to their communion, and the Syrian Church numbers some 600,000; so that without exaggeration the statement can be made that to-day there are 2,000,000 native Christians in India.

(2.) Local Statistics. The increase of the Protestant Church in particular localities is interesting, as showing the success of missions in India. In the Nellore district the American Baptist Mission has the great responsibility of building up into a new Church 60,000 converts, who have almost all come over in the last two years. In Tinnevelly, in 1878, 19,000 natives joined the mission of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; and during the same time 11,000 were baptized by the Church Mission Society. In the Ongole mission field 1,000 candidates came forward in a single day, and in three months 10,000 had joined the mission and were baptized in the name of the holy Trinity. In Tinnevelly and the Telugu country alone 60,000 souls became Christians in 1878. In the North-west Provinces, during the decade between 1861 and 1872, the Christian community nearly doubled. In Oudh the increase was 175 per cent.; in the Punjab, 64 per cent.; in Central India, 400 per cent. The Christians of the American Methodist Mission, during that decade, gained 500 per cent. In South India, where missions have had the greatest success, the increase has been (*a*) *Comparatively rapid*. During the time between the Ootacamund Missionary Conference, held in 1857, and the Bangalore Conference, in 1879, or in about two decades, the Church had increased threefold, namely: increase of native ordained agents, 186; communicants, 41,000; baptisms, 93,000; and of unbaptized adherents, about 95,000; showing a total of 200,000 baptized Christians and 127,500 unbaptized adherents, the whole amounting to about one per cent. of the population. (*b*.) *Steady*. In 1857 there were 95,000 native Christians; in 1861, 125,000; in 1871, 192,000; and in 1878, 327,500; which shows an increase in four

years, from 1857–61, of 30,000; in ten years, from 1861–71, of 70,000; and in seven years, from 1871–78, of 135,500. (*c.*) *General.* As shown in the table below, giving the increase in four principal countries, during the twenty-one years, between the two South India Missionary Conferences:

Country.	1857.	1878.	Increase.
Tamil	75,000	172,000	97,000
Telugu	3,800	83,000	79,200
Malayalam	9,600	34,000	24,000
Canareso	3,200	5,500	2,300

(3.) Rate of Increase. (*a.*) Compared with the Christian community. From 1850 to 1861 the rate of increase in the Protestant Church in India was 53 per cent., and from 1861 to 1871 the rate was 61 per cent., and it is not by any means visionary to state that the general statistics of missions in 1881 will show a rate of increase nearly if not quite equal to 70 per cent., and that the rate will continue to increase in the future. (*b.*) Compared with the whole population. In South India the native Christians of the Protestant Church amount to nearly one per cent. of the whole population, and when the Christian community of all India, Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Syrians, are considered as one body, as those who acknowledge Jesus Christ as their Lord and Saviour, they amount to nearly one per cent. of the entire population of the empire. It may increase the force of the above statistics to state that nearly all the 350,000 native Christians belonging to the Protestant missions of India have been brought over during the last seventy years, and that every year shows increased numbers of accessions.

2. *In Morals.*

The oft-repeated and most ignorant assertion of half-skeptical and ill-informed white Christians, that there *are no* native Christians in India, I believe to have an abundant and sufficient answer in the foregoing statistics; and now it seems proper to drive persistent and ungenerous maligners of Christian missions and missionaries from that other place of refuge, namely, if there *are any* native Christians in India they are *false ones.* "Such persons not unfrequently point to some of the *waifs* and *strays*, the ne'er-do-weels of the native Christian community; and, taking their cue from these hapless, restless, Christless wanderers, they throw obloquy upon the

whole native Church—as if the Church in Christian lands had not the counterparts of these to bewail, and as if it would be honest and fair to stamp the character of the Church from what is seen of its worthless members."

In showing the true state of the native Christian Church in India I produce statements of some of the oldest, wisest, and most experienced missionaries, who, during a long stay in the land in the midst of the native Church, have had abundant opportunity to know whereof they speak. A committee of the Bangalore Missionary Conference has just recorded, as their candid opinion, that "the native Church has made progress in other respects," (besides numbers.) "The Christian faith is proving itself still to be the power of God unto salvation. Those who receive it are drawing from it new health and life, and are manifesting some, at least, of the fruits of the Spirit in their moral conduct and social condition." The Rev. J. Vaughan, of the Church Missionary Society, after seventeen years' experience among the people, states:

> As regards the moral standard of the whole Christian community, communicants and non-communicants, my experience leads me, without hesitation, to affirm that the native Christians of Bengal are, upon the whole, as moral, as regular in their conduct, as is the great mass of nominal Christians at home.

Dr. George Smith, after a residence of seventeen years, testifies:

> Of the great body of the native Church it may be said that their Christianity is much of the same type as that of the rest of Christendom. Neither from our example nor in fairness, from a consideration of the origin and position of the native Christian converts, are the Churches of Europe and America entitled to expect a higher spirituality than theirs, or, at present, more rapid and extensive defections from heathenism and Islam.

The following emphatic statement was made before the Madras Diocesan Conference in 1879 by Bishop Caldwell, whose large practical experience in mission affairs gives him a right to testify. He remarked:

> I maintain that the Christians of our Indian missions have no need to shrink from comparison with Christians in a similar station in life and similarly circumstanced in England or any other part of the world. The style of character they exhibit is one which those who are well acquainted with them cannot but like.

I think I do not exaggerate when I affirm that they appear to me in general more teachable and tractable, more considerate of the feelings of others, and more respectful to superiors, and more uniformly temperate, more patient and gentle, more trustful in Providence, better church-goers, yet free from religious bigotry, and, in proportion to their means, more liberal, than Christians in England holding a similar position in the social scale. I do not say that they are free from imperfections, but I am bound to say that when I have gone away anywhere, and look back upon the Christians of this country from a distance—when I have compared them with what I have seen and known of Christians in other countries, I find that their good qualities have left a deeper impression on my mind than their imperfections. I do not know any perfect native Christians, and I may add that perfect English Christians, if they do exist, must be admitted to be exceedingly rare.

Now, add to these statements two facts, (1.) that the native Church is growing in liberality and Christian giving. From 1851 to 1861 the Church gave the sum of 93,438 rupees, but in 1871 alone it gave the almost equal amount of 85,131 rupees, which was more than one rupee for each communicant. In 1878, in South India alone, the native Church gave 75,000 rupees. The Church at Nagarcoil, through the example of one good native deacon, gave nearly 1,000 rupees more than the whole Travancore London Missionary Society Mission at the date of the Ootacamund Conference in 1857. Dr. Jewett, of the Baptist Mission in Ongale, states that the new converts contribute about 400 rupees per month, a fact which not only shows their sincerity, but proves their liberality. From a review of the Karen Missions for 1877–78, it appears that the people have done remarkably well in the way of approach toward general financial independence and self-support, the entire appropriations of the home society of the American Baptist Missionary Union to the Karen work for the year being 66,004 rupees, while the Karen Churches contributed 72,695 rupees for the purpose of carrying on the work of God in their midst. They have also given 76,154 rupees toward lands, buildings, and presses, for the benefit of the people. (2.) The number of voluntary workers and unpaid agents is increasing. An experienced missionary, in an essay on the native Church, read before the Bangalore Missionary Conference in 1879, remarked :

We see individuals here and there showing very remarkable zeal in evangelistic work. I know such in Travancore, and our Reports speak of others whom I do not personally know. We do see members of the Church, then, both men and women, engaging in voluntary work for Christ. I hear of the same thing in Tinnevelly, as when, a short time back, at the annual meeting at Mengnanapuram, on Bishop Sargent's expressing a wish to address a few words of encouragement to the voluntary workers then present, no fewer than one hundred and twenty-four men stood up, and thirty-eight others offered themselves as fresh volunteers. And not only men, but women too—women, as I have heard, in the Mission of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, being even more forward than the men. The brethren in the Madura and Nellore Missions bear emphatic testimony to the same effect.

When such can be said of the native Church in India by candid and careful men, who know whereof they affirm, and when there is such liberality and voluntary work on the part of the Christians, there must be vitality and life and consequent success.

II. Educational Advancement and Indirect Influence of Indian Missions.

1. *Educational Advancement.*

(1.) In the paper on the "Progress and Prospects of India Missions," prepared by that careful author and experienced missionary, the Rev. M. A. Sherring, of Benares, and read before the Allahabad Missionary Conference in 1872, the statement is made that "in the year 1861 there were in all the missions 75,975 pupils under instruction; in 1871 there were 122,372, of whom 22,611 were young women and girls. This shows an increase of 49,367. In the previous ten years, from 1851 to 1861, the increase was less than 12,000."

In South India, during the last twenty years, all missionary bodies, and especially all missionaries, have become even more deeply convinced of the necessity and importance of Christian schools as a missionary agency, and especially as the influence of government schools is for the most part non-Christian. Below are some of the comparative school statistics for South India:

Schools.	No. of Scholars.		
	1857.	1878.	Increase.
Anglo-Vernacular	6,327	19,659	13,332
Vernacular	28,029	52,482	24,453
Girls' schools	8,990	26,209	17,219

Between 1861 and 1871 1,621 pupils, educated in Indian mission schools, passed the university entrance examination, 513 passed the first arts examination, 154 took the degree of Bachelor of Arts, 18 that of Master of Arts, and 6 the degree of Bachelor of Laws. During the last twenty years mission schools have in every way increased threefold.

(2.) Influence of Mission Schools.

The influence of mission schools on the thousands who pass through them it is impossible to estimate. But testimony comes from all quarters as to the good they effect in various ways. (*a.*) There are always instances now and again of young men of the highest castes, and possessed of all the advantages and safeguards of an exclusive Hinduism, who are led to burst the bonds by which they are bound to their society and family, and all that is most precious to them on earth, and under the influence of the truth alone, and for Christ's sake, are led to acknowledge him as their Lord, and unite themselves to his Church. The influence and usefulness of such men in the native Church is far beyond their numbers. (*b.*) But besides the winning of these converts, Christian education is exerting an immense influence on thousands who are not yet brought to the point of confessing Christ. Through means of them the conscience of native society is being enlightened and quickened, its ideas are being modified, its feelings elevated and purified, and a congenial soil prepared for the reception of the saving seed of the kingdom. (*c.*) Another benefit of the higher Christian education, which must not be overlooked, is that which it confers on the native Church, not only in advancing temporally those who are prepared to take advantage of it, but in qualifying Christian men, both laity and clergy, to be teachers and guides of the growing Christian Church. It is a promising sign for the future of the native Church that, along with the immense increase from the lower castes, there is also a resolution to maintain a high standard of instruction, general and theological, for its pastors and catechists.*

2. *Indirect Influence of Missions.*

Indian missions have started a thousand influences, whose power cannot be directly measured, but which are telling mightily upon the great systems of the empire, and which, silent, gradual, and pervading, are destined to permeate and change the whole mass of heathenism and Islamism. Among these may be mentioned:

(1.) The General Enlightenment of the Masses. There are many things in India which cannot stand the light, and the

* "General Review, Bang. Con.," 1879.

moral and intellectual light poured in by mission preaching and teaching has caused thousands to be ashamed of many of their social and religious habits, customs, rites, and ceremonies, and to renounce all faith in them, and many, although not yet baptized, are intellectually convinced of the truth of the Christian religion.

(2.) Influence upon Idolatry. During the last half century marked changes have taken place in the Hindu's reverence for his gods, and it is a known fact that not a few have entirely renounced idolatrous practices, and others only continue them through family associations, superstitious fear, and caste prejudices, not having sufficient moral courage to avow their sentiments.

(3.) The Decay of Caste. Caste distinctions are not held so strongly as they were, and castes are drawing nearer together, while many are free to admit the absurdity and foolishness, not to say sinfulness, of them altogether.

(4.) Public Spirit. The people have a desire to learn. There is increased popular inquiry after truth. Thought is stimulated and quickened. Whenever missions are in progress justice and morality increase, and the people think more about religion, and many become earnest and sincere inquirers.

(5.) Treatment of Women. Through the influence of missions the female sex is being blessed and benefited. Women and girls by the thousand are being educated and made companions for, and not slaves of, their husbands. Said a learned Mohammedan in Turkey to a missionary: "You are right; we must educate our girls; on that depends the welfare of our country. We have lost our place among the nations because our sons have no mothers." In India missions are endeavoring to correct that, and give woman the place she should occupy. All women are now honored, widows are being permitted to remarry, and thousands of girls are at school.

(6.) The Personal and Literary Influence of Missionaries. Six hundred cultivated Christian gentlemen, with their wives and families, scattered up and down the land, must, in their constant contact with the people, exert an influence upon them for good. The literary and philological achievements of missionaries cannot be overlooked. "Since the beginning of modern missions the Bible has been translated into 212 languages,

spoken by 850,000,000 human beings, and distributed at the rate of nearly twelve copies every minute. It will not be long before the Bible will be published in every language on earth. All this has been done by missionaries. Thirty-nine of the languages referred to never had a written form until the missionaries created it."

Now, is any one prepared to shut his eyes to all these influences, and pronounce Christian missions, by means of which all these influences were set in motion, a failure? Are the more than 150,000 boys and girls under Christian instruction not being bettered thereby? And will the learning of mission schools have no effect upon their religion? Should not the fact be acknowledged that, besides the visible signs of progress there are a thousand secret forces at work by means of which India is undergoing a great moral change? And all these indicate the success of Indian missions.

III. The Ultimate Success of Missions.

I now come lastly to assert this fact, that if during the whole history of Protestant missions in India, since Ziegenbalg and Plutschan landed at Tranquibar, in 1706, or William Carey first set foot on the soil of Bengal, on the 11th of November, 1793, there had not been one single convert to the Christian faith, it would be, although natural and human, still illogical and premature to announce the failure of Christian missions in India.

1. Those who pronounce modern missions a failure must first undertake the task of proving the failure of Christianity, for missions are not a failure unless Christianity is. Those, therefore, who recommend missionaries to give up the work as hopeless should, first of all, prove the Christian religion to be false, and then, with the downfall of the Christian edifice, will be carried in utter ruin the whole scaffolding of Christian missions. But it is a most encouraging fact that while the ultimate success of missions is wrapped up in the genuineness and divinity of the Christian system, that the triumph of the Gospel of Jesus Christ in the world is most clearly and emphatically revealed. "Every knee must bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord." "He must reign until he hath put all enemies under his feet." The world is given by covenant to Jesus Christ, and it has been said to Him, by Him

who hath power to fulfill the promise, "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." "The isles wait for his law. The wilderness and the solitary places shall be glad for them; and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose." "And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord."

2. Again, God's commands and promises to us concerning mission work are an abundant assurance of its ultimate success. The marching orders of the Church are: "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations . . . to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." And the additional promise of Him who sends the messenger forth into all the world is that "the kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal till the whole was leavened," showing that the silent, hidden, active, pervading, growing principle of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as presented by the commissioned agents, will spread and permeate and overcome until the whole world is full of the glory of God.

3. As to Indian missions in particular, it may be said of them, in the language of an experienced Indian missionary, that "the enlarged activity of the native mind, the thirst for education pervading large masses of the people, the earnestness being manifested in the native Church, the energy and zeal and love for souls which some of its members are displaying, the growth of a liberal spirit among the Christian communities, the increasing number of catechists, Christian teachers, and ordained native ministers—all these circumstances, while irrefragable signs and proofs of progress, are also bases on which to build our hopes for the future."

I cannot better conclude this paper than by using the language of that grand Oriental scholar, Professor Monier Williams, with which he concludes his recent book on Hinduism:

> Then let the Christian missionary, without despising the formidable Goliaths to which he is opposed, but with the quiet confidence of a David in the strength of his own weapons, go forth

fearlessly, with the simple sling and stone of the Gospel in his hand, and do battle with his enemies, not forgetting to use the sword of the Spirit. Much ground, indeed, has been won already by the soldiers of the cross; but to secure a more hopeful advance of Christianity throughout India, a large accession to the missionary ranks of well-trained men, thoroughly conversant with the systems against which they have to contend, and prepared to *live* as well as preach the simple story of the Gospel of Christ, is urgently needed. And far more than this is needed for the complete triumph of God's truth in India. Nothing less is demanded of us Englishmen, to whose charge the Almighty has committed the souls and bodies of two hundred and forty millions of his creatures, than that every man among us, whether clerical or lay, should strive to be a missionary according to the standard set up by the first great Missionary—Christ himself. Let no lower standard of duty satisfy us. So will the good time arrive when not only every ear shall have heard the good news of the reconciliation of man to his Maker, but every tongue also of every native in India, from Cape Comorin to the Himalaya Mountains, shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

Art. III.—THE FREEDOM OF CHOICE.

Choice is the rational election of an end. It is rational in the sense that it is for a reason mentally apprehended and approved. The reason so apprehended and approved is the motive for the choice. There can be no proper choice without such a motive, whatever may be actual or possible in mere arbitrary volition. Rational motive really conditions choice. Hence, there is for us no law of freedom in a power of choosing without motive, or with the less motive, or against all motive There is no such power. There may be arbitrary volitions under such conditions, but they cannot be choices, because without the necessary rational element of choice.

The supposition that without actual motive to the good, or with all our motives, or even our stronger motives, persistently holding for the evil, a good life is yet practicable through choice, is utterly groundless. There could be no choice of the good in such a state. Hence, a good life would be impossible. The assumption of an available and responsible natural ability to choose the good in such a state is equally groundless. In the theory of natural ability and moral inability, the former

does not exclude the latter, but the two exist together. The moral inability is specifically and definitely an incapacity for the proper and necessary motive to the choice of the good. If the alleged natural ability, whatever it may be, can command the proper and necessary moral motive, then the moral inability is not a fact; if it cannot, then, respecting the good, it can be nothing more than a power of mere arbitrary volition; and, therefore, utterly insufficient for the good. No mere arbitrary power of volition, however great, can be a power unto a good life; for life, to be good, must be chosen as such, and for its own proper motives. Only for such motives is it rationally eligible. Whoever would practice the deeds of a good life must, as a conditioning fact, find his higher motives of choice in the motives to the good. On a like principle, whoever would practice the deeds of an evil life through choice must, as a conditioning fact, find his higher motives of choice in the motives to the evil. These motives, as compared with the possible motives to the good, may be infinitely the weaker; but actually, or as realized in experience, they must be the stronger at the time of choosing. This is the law of an evil life as chosen, whatever may be practicable therein —and very much is practicable—through mere arbitrary or executive volition.

Thus motives stand between us and our choices, not, indeed, as determining forces, because we are rational and moral agents with power over them, but as conditioning facts of choice. Clearly, there is this requirement within the moral sphere, the only sphere in which the question of freedom has any profound interest. We allege, not the necessity of rational motive to volition, but only to volition as choice.

Volition simply from motive-impulse is as the stronger impulse. As a mere executive volition, put forth for the attainment of the end of the impulse, there is no reason why it should not follow the stronger. There is no sufficient operating force to the contrary. This is no concession either for the approval of such as maintain the domination of motive over choice, or for the reprehension of such as, in the interest of freedom, deny that domination. Mere impulse inducing volition without reflection or judgment is in no true sense the proper and necessary motive of choice; neither is the volition

so put forth for the attainment of the end of the impulse in any true sense a choice. Hence, there is no concession respecting choice, but simply the statement of a law of volitional results from certain mental states, in none of which has choice any active part. But mental facts in which choice has no active part are without doctrinal consequence in the question of its freedom.

Choice is as the stronger motive at the time of choosing. The fact is not from the determining force of the stronger motive, but from the rational nature of choice. With two ends alternatively eligible, and a higher reason for one than the other, choice, if we make a choice, must go with the higher. We are under no necessity to choose. We may decide against both ends or with the less reason, but this decision would be an arbitrary volition, not a choice.

Many of our motive states are involuntary, and arise in purely spontaneous appetence or impulse. Strong incentives to evil so arise. Clearly this is the fact with many. It is more or less the fact with all until the good is chosen, and so chosen that the choice becomes an immanent state of the mind. These passionate impulses or appetences are urgent for speedy satisfaction, and, therefore, for the volitions through which the satisfaction may be realized. The tendency of such a state may be toward the indulgence of the evil through a mere executive volition in immediate sequence to the motive-impulse; or it may be to the choice of the evil against the good. The latter is possible only with the notion of the good and some sense of its eligibility. Without these facts we cannot be the proper subjects of a moral probation. But, with our spontaneous tendencies toward the evil, unless we have power over these motive states, power to control the appetent and impulsive through the motives of reason and religion, and to conduct life rationally and morally through choice from these higher motives, we have no valid and available law of freedom in choice. If we have power over these motive states, and over motives in their higher and truer sense; power to control the former through the latter, to overcome the one with the other, to replace the one with the other, then have we power over our choices; and, therefore, a true freedom in choice. Here is the vital question of freedom.

We allege this power over motives on the ground of certain laws and facts of mental action which vitally concern both the freedom of choice and the reality of rational and moral agency. These laws and facts must be treated severally and in proper order, but may be summarily stated thus:

1. Choice is the election of an end for a motive rationally apprehended. Hence, with exceptional cases, reflection and judgment must precede and qualify the elective volition, without which facts it cannot be a choice.

2. Choice, with all volition toward the end of a motive impulse, may be rationally suspended when one is under that influence. The suspension is rational when for the purpose of reflection and judgment upon end and motive in order to a proper election.

3. The rational suspension of all volition toward the end of any motive influence is neither choice itself nor dependent upon a motive of choice in any specific sense, but is from an immediate and essential power of personal agency.

4. With the suspension of choice and all mere executive volition, then, through a proper use of our rational and moral agency, we have power over our motives.

5. There are sufficient motives for the required choices of a rational and good life — sufficient, not only as objectively viewed, but also as realizable in experience.

6. With power over our motives, we have power over our choices, and, therefore, a true freedom of choice.

The Rationality of Choice.

Motive and choice are so vitally related that their true interpretation must place them in scientific accord. Any interpretation on which they will not answer each to the other must be erroneous. The true interpretation must find a rational element in each.

There is a rational element in the proper motive of choice. Any appetence of the sensibilities, operative toward some voluntary act for its satisfaction, may be called a motive. It is such in a primary sense and in popular usage. It is commonly treated as a motive, or included in the definition of motive, in discussions of the will or the freedom of choice. It is a motive only in the sense of an instinctive impulse toward

some volition as the means of its own satisfaction. But a volition following immediately upon such an appetence, and simply for its gratification, is merely an executive volition, and in no true sense a choice. Neither is such an instinctive impulse in itself a true and sufficient motive of choice. It lacks the necessary rational element. Hunger and thirst are instinctive impulses toward eating and drinking. The mere satisfaction of these appetites is neither the whole nor the true motive of self-government in the case. Were this so we might always eat and drink just according to our appetence—whenever it craves, whatever it craves, all that it craves. This might be a law of life for an animal, but cannot be a law for a rational man. Were these appetites always normal and healthful in tone and tendency, with a happy adjustment to our higher good, then might we always follow them, but only for the reason that they were such, and, therefore, for a rational motive. When the appetites are excessive or wayward and their free indulgence would be harmful, the real and only true motive of self-government is one of prudence or duty, a rational motive. Only with such a motive can there be self-government through choice.

The same law applies in all the circles of our spontaneous emotions and desires. Sympathy is an instinctive impulse toward voluntary action, but not in itself a law of rational action nor a motive according to which we may act with choice. Before the action can be chosen the end of it must appear to be rationally eligible. Parental affection, followed simply as a motive tendency, often leads astray from both prudence and duty. The proper conduct under this instinctive motive impulse is, in the profoundest sense, a question of prudence and duty in the light of truth and conscience. The motive on which the proper conduct may be chosen is in this rational element. Avarice is a motive-impulse toward hoarding money, but not in itself simply a motive to the choice of the hoarding. With the common facts of moral reason and conscience and grave self-questioning, presumably there was a time when the miser chose his life; while now, as dominated by a morbid passion, his deeds are no longer chosen, but merely executed through volitions in immediate sequence to the blind impulses of his avarice. Yet are they evil to him under moral law, because he might have chosen, and, if yet in a probationary state,

might still choose, a life of generosity and benevolence through the motives of reason and religion. The quick resentment arising upon wrongful injury, and instantly operative toward the infliction of injury in return, is not such a motive in itself that the retaliation may be through choice. A motive in the proper sense, and as the condition of choice, could arise only in such reason or reasons as might appear to require or justify the infliction. Thus in any and every view a rational element is necessary to the motive of choice.

As motive in its higher and truer sense must have a rational element, so must choice be rational. It may be for a reason infinitely less than is possible for a contrary election; still it can be a choice only with the rational comprehension of its motive or end. When end and impulse are taken into reflection and judgment, and the end appears to be rationally eligible, then its election for that reason is a choice. It may not be judicious or wise, but so far it is rational, and, therefore, properly a choice. Life is rational only as it is chosen. The choice which renders life rational must be for a reason rationally apprehended, however inferior that reason. Every true and noble life is the formation of rational choice from the higher motives of life. No such life is otherwise practicable.

Every one, properly under a law of moral probation, at some time chooses between an evil and a good life. In the subsequent habits of life, one may act immediately from his evil impulses and tendencies. He may thus pursue an evil life with strong and persistent willing; but if without reflection or the apprehension of any rational eligibility therein, he no longer chooses it in any proper sense of choice. His volitions which take him to the ends of his motive-impulses are immediately from these impulses, and simply executive, not elective. Yet are they morally evil and responsible because of a power in the agent to apprehend the sufficient motives to a good life and to choose it. But a good life is ever impossible through any mere executive volition. In a life of good deeds the choice of the good is the vital and necessary fact of goodness. But this choice of the good is possible only from its own proper motives. These motives must lie in the obligation and value of the good. Only as these motives are apprehended in the moral reason can the good be so chosen that there shall be

A 706357

goodness in the choice and in the deeds which follow. Thus in this highest, best sphere of volition, choice is rational. It is not simply from a moral impulse, but also from a moral reason as the motive.

Only an agent rationally constituted is capable of ordering his life through choice. We have the powers of a rational agency; but our life is conducted though choice only in the rational use of these powers. An animal has motive impulse and volitional power. It wills an end with executive energy. But it does not choose the end and cannot, because without faculties for its rational apprehension. Its volitions are immediately from the impulses of instinct. The operation is irrational. Such are our own volitions when there is no exercise of reason between motive-impulse and volition, whatever its end. The intervention of reason, either as intuitively active or as exercised in reflection and judgment upon end and motive, is the one fact essentially differentiating rational agency in volition from the operation of mere animal instinct. As between the two, there are different powers and cognitions, different ends, different motive-impulses in operation; but, except on the proper use of our rational faculties, mere impulse is equally the determining law of volition in the two cases. Mind thus moves volitionally in the sphere of animal instinct. Its only possible movement in the higher sphere of rational agency is by making reason the law of its choices.

It does not hence follow that on every instance of a new motive-impulse, even where morality is concerned, a season of rational reflection is requisite. Life is not thus in separate deeds, but according to some rule or law. A good life must be ordered on principle and in obedience to a recognized law of duty. A good man may have a sudden motive-impulse toward some wrong volition or deed, but reflection and judgment have gone before and settled the principle to which his present action must conform. With these facts, the instant application of this principle answers for all the requirements of reason in choice.

Such is the law of rational agency, an agency that is a nullity without a power over motives and volitions. There is no power over motives and volitions unless we may subject them to reflection and judgment. Without this agency there can be

no power of self-government through choice. There is no other rational self-government. The only alternative must be a succession of irrational volitions and deeds in immediate and necessary sequence to the stronger motive-impulses. In any motive state, other impulses may arise to influence the pending volition; but, except as responsive to the call of our rational agency and subject to its control, they must be purely spontaneous, and, therefore, powerless to release our volitions and consequent deeds from the absolute domination of mere motive-impulse. Nothing else than reflection and judgment as possibly influencing choice in any rational sense can come between motive and choice. Their interposition is the office of rational agency. Without that interposition there is no proper use of this agency, and, therefore, no rational self-government through choice.

The Rational Suspension of Choice.

Choice, with all volition toward the attainment of the motive end, may be suspended when one is under motive influence. The suspension is rational when for the purpose of reflection and judgment upon end and motive, that the election may be prudent, or wise, or responsive to the requirement of duty.

What is rational agency, or what can it avail for the higher ends of life, if, under the laws of mental action, there be no place for the proper use of its powers? Where can this use be so important as in the controlment of mental states and facts which vitally concern the power of rational self-government? Life is worthy of man only as it is from his own rational and moral agency. As such, it must be rationally chosen. Our choices are our most important, our morally responsible volitions. Through them we determine the ends of our life and the deeds for their attainment. Our character and destiny are in our choices. But if there be no power of rationally suspending choice, with all volition toward the motive end, when under motive influence, there can be no place for the reflection and judgment necessary to rational self-government or to the proper choice of life. Our spontaneous motive-impulses must be the immediate determining causes of our volitions. Hence, the power of rationally suspending choice, with all volition toward the attainment of the

motive end, is necessary to choice itself, and the proper use of it a necessary mode of conducting life rationally.

In the habits of human life many omit this rational suspension of choice and mostly act immediately from spontaneous motive-impulse. They do this when the conduct is profoundly important, morally responsible even, and the call loud and urgent for the most reflective and rational action. Their conduct is simply executed, not chosen. This is consistent with personal agency, rational and moral, as constituted, though not with the proper use of its powers. These powers are not self-acting, but simply an investment which as personal agents we may and should use. If self-acting they could not be the powers of a proper rational and moral agency. Without their use our life is not from our own agency. Without their possession we are incapable of choosing our life or of conducting it rationally and morally.

The fact that many live with little reflection or rational self-control, and act merely and immediately from the motive-impulses of spontaneous appetence or desire, is often alleged in their reprehension. They should not be reprehended if without the power of rationally postponing all volition toward the end of their appetences when under such motive influence. For, if without this power, they are utterly incapable of conducting life rationally. Their only law of life must be one of mere spontaneous motive forces, commonly more wayward and violent, and far more ruinous, than the impulses of mere animal instinct.

This power of rational agency is manifest in the relative facts of psychology and human life. It is a fact above question, that often under motive influence all volition toward the end is deferred and held under deliberation. How shall the fact be explained? On a denial of rational deferment, there are only two modes in which an explanation can even be attempted. One is to account the delay to a mental state of indifference. But this is utterly inadmissible, because the motive state is manifest in the fact of deliberation. No one deliberates on questions of indifference in order to a judicious election or choice. The other is to account the delay to an exact balance of opposing motive influences. This would be practically the same as a state of indifference, though psycho-

logically different. The case is hypothetically admissible on the theory that volition or choice is absolutely determined by motive force. On the denial of rational deferment and reflection, motive influences or tendencies are the only forces practically operative in the mind. There is a motive tendency toward a given volition or choice. The only force which can prevent this result is a counter motive influence. Hence, the continuance of the delay requires for all that time an exact balance of opposing motive forces. The slightest preponderance of either would at once determine the volitional result, just as the heavier weight immediately preponderates the scale. Is this, then, a rational account of the case? This mental state of interested deferment runs through hours and days, sometimes through months and years, even. Can the fact be explained simply as the result of an exact balance of opposing motive forces? This is the only possible account, if we deny the power of rational deferment. Its utter insufficiency concludes the reality of this power.

The denial of this law of rational agency is by logical consequence the assumption that all great and worthy lives in the various spheres of human activity and achievement, in science and philosophy, in statesmanship and patriotism, in philanthropy and piety, are the formation of volitions in immediate sequence to motive-impulses or tendencies, and without any power of personal agency in the proper choice of ends. The assumption is, and must be, that all the truer and nobler lives, wrought in patience and self-denial, in an ever-enduring fortitude and the loftiest moral heroism, are the formation of purely spontaneous motive-impulses, each determining its own volitional result, just as it may exceed others in the force of its impulsion. But no true philosophy of such lives is possible with the notion that their formative law is in purely spontaneous motive forces, no one of which, as it may be the stronger, will submit to any restraint or delay under the immediate power of personal agency, but must of its own energy go at once to the volitional result of its own impulsion. In truth, reflection must be the habit, and the highest practical reason the guide of every such life. Its formation is possible only as the spontaneous motive tendencies may be subject to the personal agency. Over all the exigences of weakness and trial

and adverse tendency this agency must be sovereign, and have in command the weightier motives of reason and conscience, which may ever re-enforce the high purposes of a great and good life. Hence, the power of rationally suspending all volition toward a motive end when under the motive influence must be a power of personal agency. The philosophy of every great and good life is a conclusive witness to its reality.

Immediate Power of Suspending Choice.

We here face the most subtle and perplexing objection to this vital law of freedom in choice. It is very easy most plausibly and persistently to affirm, that the position maintained respecting the suspension of choice gives no releasement either from an absolute dependence upon motive or from its determining influence upon our volitions. But most that may be thus said must be mere assertion, without possible verification in the facts of psychology or the laws of mind. Such assertion may be met with counter assertion equally broad and plausible. So far, if nothing is gained, neither is any thing lost. However, we shall not thus rest the question, but maintain our position on the ground of facts both of psychology and a true personal agency. The result will give us the rational suspension of choice, not as choice, but as immediately from rational agency itself.

The contrary assumption is that the suspension of all volition toward the end of any motive-impulse for the purpose of reflection and judgment upon end and motive, must itself be a choice and from some motive of choice. The mental action is not otherwise possible. Some reason operative as a motive of choice is necessary to its rationality. If a sufficient motive reason be present to the mind, it must pause and reflect. Such are the ready, plausible assertions in the case. Their sense is that any rational deferment of elective or executive volition, when under motive influence, with all the intervening rational action, is absolutely dependent upon motive and necessarily determined according to its stronger impulse.

On the truth of this assumption the mind, when under motive-impulse, cannot pause and reflect, nor take account of any relative fact or principle which might influence the pending volition, except another motive intervene to determine the rational action. But such motive must be assumed to arise

spontaneously, if at all. No intrinsic power of immediate suspension and reflection can be conceded to rational agency because it is utterly inconsistent with the alleged dependence upon motive. There can be no delay and no casting about for any motive or reason counter to the present inclination, simply as the rational action of the personal agent. If so conditioned by spontaneous motive influence, why should he, or how can he, pause and reflect whether there be any reason against following a present inclination, except some motive impulse spontaneously arise which so determines his mental action?

If such be the law of mental action in this case, our volitions are not in any true sense from our own agency, but are immediately determined by our purely spontaneous motive states. Indeed, the mind is no longer a rational agent, because without the power of rational action from itself. The fact is not other because some spontaneous motive-impulse, opportunely arising, may determine the mind to pause, or even turn it away to reflection and the apprehension of reasons counter to the present inclination. There is still wanting the essential power of rational self-movement. The mind cannot act from itself as a rational agent, but is absolutely conditioned by a law of spontaneous motive influence. The irrational soul of an animal is not more dependent upon the impulse of instinct or passive under its dominance. That the mental movement determined by the spontaneous motive is to reflection and the apprehension of reasons counter to the present motive-tendency brings no relief, because even in such facts the mind is none the less dependent upon the spontaneous motive or passive under its power. This is the fact of necessitation in the case, and the fact exclusive of a true rational agency, whatever the mental action induced. It behooves all who hold such a philosophy to explain the consistency of this necessitation with rational agency, or how it is that an agency intrinsically free—free in the power of rational self-action—can be rationally active only through the determination of purely spontaneous motive. But this explanation never can be given.

Thus a proper rational agency is excluded. There is something far higher and other in this agency than is possible under a law of absolute dependence upon purely spontaneous motive. It consists in an intrinsic power of immediate self-movement,

a power to pause and reflect when under the impulse of motive, a power whereby the mind may turn itself to such facts or principles as may concern the present inclination, or call them up and hold them under deliberation. For all this there is required no other power or reason than what is ever at the command of a rational agent, so long as his proper agency remains. But the law of an absolute dependence upon spontaneous motive-impulse for any reflection or judgment while under that impulse utterly precludes this power, and leaves the mind to be driven helplessly onward in an endless succession of motive states, while its volitions are as determinately swayed by these spontaneous impulses as are the orbital movements of the planets by the forces of gravitation. We have no power over our motive states or motives in their higher sense; no power against them, or to modify them, or to replace one with another, and, therefore, no power to avoid or in the least modify any volition which they may induce. The concession of such a power would be a surrender of the whole assumption of our dependence upon spontaneous motive influence. But if we have not this power we have no true rational agency. It is really and utterly excluded. Now any position which, either by assertion or logical consequence, denies to personal mind a true rational agency, or any power necessary to it, must be a false position. Hence rational agency is, and must be, independent of spontaneous motive for its rational action when under motive influence.

The rational deferment of all volition toward the motive end when under motive-impulse is, as previously stated, for the purpose of reflection and judgment upon impulse and end, that the action in the case may be judicious or wise. It is the proper course for an agent rationally constituted and responsible for his volitions. Often the instant application of a principle previously settled may answer for the law of rational conduct. In many cases the proper action may be intuitively or instantly clear. But when it is not clear, as often it is not, our conduct is rational only as we take time and give the question such reflection as may be requisite to a proper judgment.

This deferment is not choice. The mental action is not the same in the two cases. The question may be appealed to consciousness or tested by the most searching analysis of all the

mental facts concerned, and the result will verify our position. Choice has its own mental form, well-known in consciousness, but really known only there. Simply as an elective volition it is the act of an instant. The pre-elective rational action is of the choice simply as the prerequisite of its rational quality. Yet the relation is vital to choice itself. We hold this view of choice; while the theory on which the single or stronger motive impulse must immediately determine the volitional result cannot hold it, because it would thereby concede all the power and requirement of rational agency which we maintain. But in no sense does our view identify the rational deferment of choice with the elective volition as mental acts. They are not the same. In the light of consciousness they are distinct and different. Hence the rational deferment of choice has not the same relation to motive as choice itself. It is not from an elective motive, nor dependent upon it, but is from an immanent power of rational self-action in personal agency.

Motive, in its higher and truer sense, is the reason for choice, but it is a specific kind of reason, because both motive and choice are specific mental facts. Motives, however diverse, are all one in kind, and operative in one mode. They all exist in a form of conscious interest in some end, and as a rational inducement toward its choice. They are motives because such an inducement. Thus the motive of choice is a specific mental state, and operative toward a specific mental act in the election of a definite end. Now consciousness, however searchingly questioned, will ever deny that such a motive is either the actual or the necessary inducement of that rational action which must precede choice as the prerequisite of its rational quality.

Consciousness is witness to the fact that this pre-elective rational action is immediately from the rational agency itself. The power so to act is intrinsic and necessary to this agency. It is an ever-usable power, so long as a true rational agency remains. Hence this agency may ever find in itself the spring of rational action. A power to pause and reflect when brought under motive influence, and before our important volitions or choices is the essential power of rational agency. We assert only the same truth when we affirm that a rational agent can act rationally. With this true and simple statement our position scarcely requires illustration or proof. For to admit the

reality of rational agency, and then deny its necessary power, is a contradiction. Who would attempt a philosophy of choice or pretend to build up a doctrine of responsible freedom on the denial of a true rational agency to the mind? But with the admission of this agency, it must be admitted that the mind can act rationally. Hence it must be independent of specific motive states, and have the power of rational action immediately from itself.

Objections may be urged against the reality of this power in view of the blindness of ignorance, the perversion of error, the enervation of vice, the thralldom of evil habit; but these are incidental questions or side issues, which in no sense antagonize our position. There are such instances, as many facts witness. Hence it is clear that rational agency may be greatly enfeebled, or, possibly, entirely overborne by the force of evil habit and vicious tendency. But this does not affect our position, for it is affirmed of a true rational agency, and not of a mind in such a state of thralldom from a wrong use of its powers, that its proper agency no longer remains.

There are results of benefit to freedom from proper rational and moral conduct, as well as results of evil from wrong conduct. By a right use of the powers of our personal agency—a use just according to its constitution and our own obligation—we may reach the highest measure of self-command and moral freedom.

We are not constantly in some special motive state or under some strong motive impulse, urgent for the volition which will carry us to its end. Nor is such a motive state either the limit of our rational agency or its highest sphere. In the hours of freedom from these special motive states this agency remains, with the power of reflection upon the laws and duties of life. In these hours of mental quietude and self-command, duty in all its relations and requirements may be calmly considered and rules of right conduct settled. We may thus give to the purpose of a reflective and upright life the strength and persistence of habit. We may so make it a law of life always to pause and reflect under any doubtful solicitation, that this law shall become an immanent state of our mind. It will thus be easy for us, even when suddenly brought under strong motive impulse or temptation, to pause and reflect, and so take to ourselves strength from the weightiest reasons against the wrong

doing to which we may be solicited. We need no elective motive for so doing; we need only the power which is intrinsic to rational agency. Nor is the action through choice in any strict sense.

Thus the proper rational action when under motive-impulse, the reflection and judgment upon end and impulse which should precede any volition toward the end, and must precede it if life is to be conducted rationally, is from an immediate power of rational self-action in rational agency. The denial of this power is the denial of rational agency itself. Logically, the consequence must be a helpless passivity of life under an absolute law of purely spontaneous motive-impulse.

Power over Motives.

With an immediate power of rational agency to postpone all volition toward any motive end, and to take end and motive with relative practical facts and principles under reflection and judgment, we have power over our motives. Power over motives is power over choices. Power over choices is true freedom in choice.

An analytic presentation of the laws and facts of mind with which this power of personal agency is vitally concerned will evince the reality of the power itself, and also conclude its sufficiency as a law of freedom in choice. It is proper, therefore, to treat, severally and in order, motive states of mind, laws of motive states, power over laws of motive states, power over motive states and motives.

There is a distinction between motive states, simply as such, and motives in their higher sense or as the condition of choice. The former may be simply a spontaneous appetence or impulse, while the latter must combine with some form of conscious interest a rational element as its proper eligible quality. This distinction, however, need not be formally maintained in the present point of discussion, for the laws and facts concerned are the same for both.

Any form of conscious interest operative as an incentive toward any volition in order to the attainment of an end is a motive state. The fact is the same whether the conscious interest arises from any one of our manifold sensibilities, or in the rational or moral part of our nature. There is no motive

state without some form of conscious interest in the attainment of some object or end.

There are certain laws of motive states. The same laws are common to all these states. Their place and value in the question of freedom will appear as we proceed with the discussion.

Motive states of mind are under a law of objective relation. They can take no practical form necessary to a motive quality except on the cognitive view of their object or end. There is a law of objective relation common to all forms of mental activity. In all thinking there must be a thought-object, some fact of the mind itself, or something extraneous to it. In the profoundest abstraction there is something objective to thought, without which the mental process would be impossible. In the purest conceptualism, as against realism, there is objectivity to the conception, and as necessary to the conceptive state, as an external object to the perception of vision. In the most transcendental intuitions, in the sublimest creations of the imagination, in the most airy soarings of fancy, in the dreamiest revery, there is ever, and there must ever be, something objective to thought.

Such also is the law of facts in our appetent or affectional nature. There are purely spontaneous appetences. They spring from our constitution, and would spring all the same were we without any notion of objects which might satisfy them. But in this case they could not, in any proper sense, be motive states of mind, because without tendency toward any volition or deed in order to their satisfaction. Such a tendency is impossible without the notion of something satisfying. The same law applies to truths or conceptions of the reason, whether philosophic, moral, or religious. Such truths, however ideal or impersonal as conceived, are often truths of the profoundest conscious interest and the most forceful practical tendency, but only with notion of some end to be achieved. All objective motivity is powerless over the subjective in any practical sense, except as in mental conception and with the notion of a practical end. Such is one law of motive states of mind.

Motive states are spontaneous on their proper objective relation. With a subjective and objective motivity in correlation, then on the perception or conception of the motive object the result is a spontaneous impulse or tendency toward some

volition or deed answering to the motive state. Thus the sense of hunger and thirst, with the notion of food and water, immediately tends toward eating and drinking. The sense of moral obligation and responsibility, with the notion of some deed required as a duty, becomes a motive-impulse toward its performance. The principle is the same in all forms of conscious interest in motive ends, whether of the sensibilities or the reason. Thus, motive states spontaneously arise and remain with the proper conception of their objects or ends. There is no immediate will power either to prevent or repress them. They are necessary facts under their own law. This is no concession to the theory of the domination of motive over volition or choice. If any would so claim it he is most welcome. Our position is not broadly that we have no volitional power over these motive states, either to prevent or repress or change them, but qualifiedly that we have no such immediate volitional power. This is because they are spontaneous and necessary states under their own law. That they are such will be found wholly to the advantage of a true freedom in choice. The advantage is in the fact that, because motive states are such, we have mediately volitional power over them, and all the power requisite to the truest freedom.

The third law of motive states is not so much a distinct law as a special fact of such states consequent to the first law. If motive states are under a law of objective relation, and possible only on the mental conception of their proper object or end, then by consequence they must terminate with this conditioning relation. So soon as the motive object or end of these states, only on the conception of which they can arise and exist, is dismissed from thought, they must cease to have any motive quality or tendency. Such are the laws of motive states of mind. Motives, in the higher, truer sense of motives, are under the same laws.

We have power over the laws of motive states. This is the third principle or fact in which we ground the power over motives. If motive states are under such laws of objective relation, and we have power over these laws, then we must have power over the motive states. Also, a power over motive states must be a power over motives in the higher, truer sense of motive, because both are under the same laws.

Power over the laws of motive states is simply power over the practical relation of the mind to motive objects. These laws are conditioned by this relation. If a present motive object must, of its own nature and force, so occupy the mind and fix the attention, that we can neither dismiss it nor call into thought and reflection any other, we have no power to determine the relation of our mind to such objects. But if we can dismiss a present motive object, or replace it in the mind with another, or call another into thought and reflection, then the power is real and sufficient. Have we such a power? This is really the question, whether, as rational agents, we have power to use our mental faculties according to their own nature and office? But, as correctly so stated, the question determines for itself an affirmative answer.

Rational agency requires a certain complex of usable faculties. There must be a synthesis of rational intelligence, and sensibility and will. Of course there can be no rational agency without rational intelligence. Sensibility, as applicable to man in its lower sense, is not a necessity to rational agency. There must, however, be an emotional nature or a capacity for conscious interest in the ends of volition or choice. There is no eligibility to any being in the universe without some form of such interest. Nor could there be any rational voluntary action. All possible action would be purely spontaneous or automatic. Neither angel or archangel, however removed from the lower forms of human sensibility, nor even God himself, could be a rational agent without a capacity for conscious interest in the ends of volition or choice. There must be such an interest if only in the purest philosophic or moral reason. Of course there must be a will faculty, without which there is no proper agency, much less rational agency. A rational agent is such by virtue of this trifold synthesis of attributes.

Man is a rational agent with these three forms of attribute. But the intelligence is not the agent; the sensibility or emotional nature is not the agent; the will is not the agent. Man himself, as so constituted, is the agent. He is a rational agent because with such faculties he can act rationally. While a rational agent only by virtue of these faculties, yet is he above them with power to use them. They have in relation to him an instrumental quality and function, and he can use

them for their appropriate ends, just as he might use any voluntary bodily organ or any implement or tool. Mental faculties, in the very nature and definition of them, are usable faculties. Without the power of using them the proper notion of rational agency is utterly eliminated.

The will, as a usable faculty, is most proximate to the agent, and is immediately at his command. This does not imply an absolute power of volition any more than my voluntary use of a pen in this writing implies an absolute will power over it. Volition, in the lowest sense, is conditioned by some spontaneous mental state; as merely for the attainment of the end of some appetence or impulse by the notion of the end; as elective, by the apprehension of the reason for the choice. But nothing so conditioning volition is inconsistent with an immediate power of the agent over the will faculty. On the proper occasion he may so use it, and through volition control or use whatever is subject to him as an agent.

Thus he may use his intellectual faculties. Thinking is often spontaneous, or, at least, not consciously voluntary. It is none the less true that through the will we have the voluntary control of our mental faculties and may freely use them according to their own nature and office. Thus we may select the subject of thought and give it conscious attention and profound study. We may dismiss one subject and take up another. Every rational agent can do this. Every one who conducts life rationally must do it. The question of this power may be appealed to the facts of consciousness and they will verify its reality. The achievements of rational thought conclude the case. There are only two modes of mental activity: one spontaneous, the other by intentional origination and direction. Will the former answer for a philosophy of thought, as unfolded in human history? Is not the latter a necessity to that philosophy? Whence the civilizations of the race? Whence the facts of the higher civilizations, the arts and inventions, the sciences and philosophies, the literatures, the high achievements in the spheres of æsthetic art, the masterly statesmanship? Not from spontaneous mental revery, but from the rational use of mental faculties. These marvelous achievements were possible only as rational agents had the power of volitionally originating and rationally directing their mental

activities. This includes the power of determining the faculties to any particular subject of thought.

With such a power in the use of mental faculties, we can direct attention and thought to one object or another, or dismiss one and call up another, or replace one with another. Thus we can determine the relation of our mind to motive objects; whether a present object shall hold its place and engage the entire attention, or what other shall come into attention with it or entirely replace it; whether one object or another shall be in the mental apprehension, with its immediate power over the subjective motivity. But in these very relations are the laws of our motive states. Hence, power over these relations is power over the laws of motive states, and, therefore, over these states. With a motive object in conception there is a spontaneous motive state in correlation to it; with a dismission of the object from thought, a termination of the motive state; with its replacement by a different motive object, a change in motive state. Thus, with power over the relations of our mind to motive objects, we can determine our own motive states. The result is just according to the laws of these states. Such a power we have, however metaphysical speculation and subtlety may seek or even seem to obscure it. The power itself is intrinsic to rational agency, original and simple, indefinable and inexplicable, yet none the less real and manifest.

Any one may readily test and verify the reality of this power. Some motive object comes into your perception or mental conception. It matters not how it comes, but only that it is there. Being there, it moves upon the correlate appetence, or affection, and draws you into a motive state. This state, spontaneously arising under its own law, is itself a tendency toward some volition or deed for the attainment of the motive object, or the satisfaction of the appetence or affection which it has awakened. No law of your mind binds you to this motive state or to any volition or deed toward which it may tend. You can separate yourself from the motive object or dismiss it from thought, and thus put it out of the relation to your mind which is necessary to its motive influence, or you can take into thought and reflection some fact or truth of counter motive influence, and the former will yield to the latter. You may suddenly become the subject of a sponta

neous impulse or tendency which you would not follow. Your state of mind against it may be simply a cool judgment, while the motive state is full of fiery impulse. But however intense the impulse or cool the judgment, you can take time to reflect. This you can do as a rational and responsible agent. Then you can summon into thought and conscience the weighty reasons of prudence and piety against the indulgence of the present motive tendency. These reasons, so apprehended and meditated, will give you a counter motive state. This state may have far less intensity than the former, and yet be infinitely stronger in the motives of reason and conscience—infinitely the stronger, not only intrinsically or potentially, but as realized in experience. You are called to some duty. Your mental apprehension of it may be wanting in clearness and vigor, while there is but slight response of moral feeling. Other feelings may be strongly adverse. In this state you can take time and call into meditation the weighty reasons of obligation and spiritual well-being which urge the duty. These reasons, so meditated, will bring the responsive disposition.

Thus have we power over the laws of motive states, and, hence, over these states. It is the necessary power of rational agency. Mere intellectual faculties, however great, cannot constitute this agency. Our own faculties might be lifted to a vastly higher degree, or even to that of the divine, were it possible, and still we would not be rational agents. There must be a power of rationally using these faculties. This is a power over the laws of motive states and over these states. Thus one can produce a motive state where he needs it, and restrain or replace another where he should be free from it.

We thus have power over motives. As motive is something more than a mere spontaneous appetence or impulse, and includes a rational element, power over motives is more than power over mere motive states. Yet the laws are the same in the two cases. Both classes are spontaneous under the same law of objective relation. This relation is determined for both simply by taking the motive object into proper mental apprehension. As we thus apprehend a rational or moral motive object we realize in experience a rational or moral motive. Through these higher and more imperative motives we have power over the lower appetites and desires. We are free, or

have the power of freedom, from a dominating law of spontaneous appetence or impulsive passion. A far higher and better life must be within our power as rational and moral agents.

If without power over motive states, and over motives as requisite to the choice of the rational and the good, our life must be spontaneous and flow with the current of our lower tendencies; while with this power we may subject it to rational and moral control. Over the impulsions of appetite and passion we may enthrone the rational and the moral. How this may be done has already been explained. We are not helplessly passive under any one spontaneous impulse, or any stronger or strongest impulse in the coincidence of two or more of diverse tendency. We have no immediate power of volition to prevent or repress such a motive state; but we have immediate power to defer any volition or deed toward its end. Then through reflection and judgment we may realize the motives of reason and conscience, and direct our life from them.

Is this power ever used? So it may be asked in objection. We have previously recognized the fact of a widely prevalent omission of this use. The question, however, or the objection which it clothes, is irrelevant. For the present we are simply maintaining the reality of this power, not its use. But, as a question of fact, it has been used, and in instances innumerable. If once used, it is a common usable power of personal agency. If never used, then never in all the history of the ages has any man in a single instance rationally determined his own conduct. Such is the logical consequence, and even the formal assumption of that irrelevant objection to our doctrine of rational agency. There is no need of further refutation or reply; else we might again array the great facts of civilization, as practicable only through a rational use of the faculties of a proper personal agency, and the many instances of rational and moral self-direction and control in the formation of great and good lives, as forever concluding the reality of this power, and also the fact of its very frequent use.

Sufficient Motives for Required Choices.

Many things have for us no eligibility. The fact does not concern our freedom, because we are not required to choose

them. For required choices there must be sufficient motives. We cannot otherwise have true freedom. This is consequent to the rational nature of choice. We choose for a motive rationally apprehended. When the requisite motive is not present to the mind, or within its power to command, there is no proper sphere of choice. With alternative ends of equal interest simply to the sensibilities, we may decide for either or against both, but by an arbitrary volition, not a choice. If we may combine with either a rational element, or a higher rational element with the one than with the other, then may we choose it. If against the impulses of the sensibilities or the motives of secular interest we may command a motive of duty, then may we choose the end of this motive. Hence the law of freedom is this: for the required choices of prudence and duty we may command the proper motives of choice. The principles of this law have already come into the discussion; most of them sufficiently so. Therefore we further require little more than their proper application. Yet a present analytic statement of the cardinal facts of the question will be helpful to clearness of view. The law of freedom, as given, requires, 1. Objective motives of proper eligibility for the required choices of prudence and duty; 2. A subjective motivity to their influence, as necessary to the actual motives of choice; 3. A power of personal agency to place the mind in such cognitive relation to the objective motives, that we may realize in experience the actual motives to the choice of their ends.

The reality of the requisite objective motives of proper eligible quality none will question. A life conducted with prudence or reason is, with all who think, far higher and better than a life determined by spontaneous appetence or passion. Duty asserts its own superiority of excellence and authority. These facts more than concede the requisite objective motives.

Subjective capacity for rational motives. A capacity for the rational motives of life will scarcely be questioned. It cannot be without questioning the fact of rational agency itself. Agency, in whatever grade, must have every capacity or facility necessary to it. We are rational agents only as we have the ability to conduct life rationally. But, as previously shown, life can be so conducted only as it is chosen. It can be ration-

ally chosen only from its own rational motives. These motives are such, not simply as objective, but only as realized in experience. This requires something more than a mere intellective conception of the rational ends of life. It is still true that there can be no actual motive without some form of conscious interest in the end of choice. Hence the rational ends of life, as mentally conceived, must be realized in a conscious interest therein. Only with this interest can they be rationally eligible. As a question of fact, the rational ends of life have with many minds a consciously realized eligibility. One instance of a life rationally conducted must conclude the subjective capacity for these rational motives. There are innumerable instances of the kind.

Capacity for the motives of morality and religion. We here reach the profoundest issues of this question. It is here, too, that objections will be most strenuously urged against our position. We firmly and confidently maintain it. There must be a capacity for the motives of morality and religion, else there can be no actual motive to the choice of either. Without the proper motive neither can be chosen. Without the choice neither is possible. In this case certain rational ends of life, as below the moral and spiritual, would be the limit of our agency. It could not rise into the moral and religious sphere. No agency can rise a grade above its capabilities. As the agency of rational mind is impossible to mere animal instinct, so would moral and religious agency be impossible to man if without a capacity for the necessary moral and religious motives. There must be this capacity, either as native or gracious, else we cannot be under obligation to the choice of either. As mere animal instinct cannot be answerable to the laws of a rational life, no more could we be answerable to the laws of a good life if without a capacity for the necessary motives to its choice.

We are not unmindful of the relations of this question to Christian theology. It is easy to array the doctrine of a native depravity against this capacity for the motives of morality and religion. Both are truths, and without either contradiction or collision. Neither is less a truth for the reason of the other. The capacity for moral and religious motive is none the less sufficient for a proper moral and religious agency

because of its gracious original. It is a gracious endowment of fallen humanity through a redemptive economy.

We appeal the question of this capacity to the moral facts of human history, and none the less confidently because of the prevalent facts of moral darkness, stolidity, and vice. The moral life of humanity is double, a life within a life. With all the facts of evil there are the more widely prevalent facts which evince the common sense of moral obligation and responsibility and the common appreciation of obedience to the duties of morality and religion as the supreme excellence and wisdom of human life. These facts require, as their necessary source, a subjective state, which constitutes a capacity for the motives of morality and religion, and hence conclude its reality. As for the question of moral freedom, it is indifferent whether the source of this capacity be native or gracious. For the consistency of Scripture truth it must have a gracious original.

The motives of morality and religion are the paramount motives of human life. They are such, not only in intrinsic quality and as objective motives, which few question and the moral consciousness of humanity affirms, but also as realizable in experience. Only as the objective motive is properly apprehended in the consciousness can there be any actual motive. The possibility of this realization lies in our subjective motivity to the paramount motives of morality and religion as previously treated. Hence, in the realizations of experience the good may have for us the highest eligibility and be chosen against the enticements of evil.

Then the power of rational and moral agency, as previously explained, gives us the command of these paramount motives of life. It is simply the power of placing the mind in practical relation to the great truths and facts which embody the motives of morality and religion. We can determine our profound attention to these great questions and study them just as we do in the case of secular questions. Our moral motivities will answer to these great motive truths and facts so apprehended and meditated. Conscience and moral reason are, at least, potential realities with every one yet under a law of moral probation. They only wait for the proper reflection to rise into activities of a profound conscious interest in the ends

which they concern. In these activities shall thus be realized in experience the paramount motives to the choice of the good. Thus, the thoughtless can pause and reflect, while moral duty and the interests which hinge upon it shall rise upon his view as of all things the most imperative and important. The worldly mind can deeply concern itself with heavenly things. The sensual can apprehend the higher and diviner law of temperance and purity. The covetous and selfish can ponder the law of charity and realize its imperative claim. The hard and cruel can yield to the pathos of kindness and sympathy.

This is no doctrine of instantaneous self-regeneration, or of self-regeneration in any sense. It is simply the law under which our moral agency can realize the paramount eligibility of the good. The power of this agency, especially within the moral and religious sphere, is a gracious endowment. Also the divine Spirit is ever present for our aid, and often active as a light in the moral reason and a quickening force in the conscience. Here is the deeper source and the sufficient source of a true moral agency, with the capacity for the motives of duty. The prevalent habits of evil are no necessary result of an impotence of the moral nature. Nor are they consequent simply to a non-use of the powers of moral agency, but often and mostly even from a persistent resistance to the spontaneous apprehensions of the moral reason and the impulsions of conscience, especially as enlightened and quickened by the divine Spirit. These facts render it the more manifest that through the proper and obligatory use of the powers of our moral agency we can realize the paramount eligibility of the good and choose it against the evil.

This primary choice of the good is not the realization of a new spiritual life in regeneration, but is only, and can only be, the election of its attainment. The choice of such an end and its attainment are clearly separable facts. A new spiritual life in regeneration, if chosen as an end, still has its own law of effectuation, and in itself must be entirely from the divine Spirit. The sphere of *synergism* lies back of this, where, through the help of grace and a proper use of the powers of our spiritual agency, we may choose the good; while that of the divine *monergism* is specially in the work of moral regeneration. Here the doctrine of the most rigid monergist

is the reality of truth; while synergism within its own sphere is equally the reality of truth.

Whoever, by private entreaty or public address, seeks to persuade any one from an evil to a good life must assume the very law of freedom which we here maintain. No one in such an endeavor allows the plea of indifference or moral insensibility, or the dominance of propensities to the evil, or the want of realized motives to the choice of the good, to close the case. He will urge any and all such to pause and think, to take into thought and reflection the profound obligations and interests of morality and religion, on the apprehension of which, with the divine help, the paramount motives to the good shall be realized in experience when the good can be chosen against the evil. Every earnest moral and religious worker does this. The true evangelistic workers of the Christian centuries, and without respect to theological creed, have so entreated and persuaded the thoughtless and vicious. Thus prophets and apostles and the Master himself entreated evil men. So shall we continue to do. It is all groundless and without possible result, except as the evil have a capacity for moral and religious motives, and a power of personal agency whereby they may so place their minds in cognitive relation to the good that it shall be apprehended in the moral reason and in a profound conscious interest as supremely eligible.

True Freedom of Choice.

This is the doctrine of a rational and a real freedom. It rests upon no false ground, and is constructed with no irrelevant or irreconcilable principles. Every vitally related fact of psychology and personal agency has its proper place and office.

It is not the freedom of arbitrary volition, or the liberty of indifference. A life without interest in its chosen ends must be utterly forceless and useless. Indeed, it could have no chosen ends. It is the sheerest assumption that either the primary choice of the good or the maintenance of a good life is possible, with indifference to goodness and its blessedness as ends. The assumption is utterly unphilosophic and groundless. The theory of a valid and responsible freedom under a law of moral inability is of all theories the most irra-

tional. It requires that the good be chosen, not only without actual motive, but also against the dominance of inevitable counter motive. By so much does it sink below the liberty of indifference or the freedom of mere arbitrary volition.

The doctrine here maintained is clear of all these errors. Personal agency is the ground truth. This agency must be a reality, else there can be no place for the question of freedom. If a reality, it must have all requisite faculties. Then freedom should no longer be a question in issue. Its denial is the equivalent of a denial of personal agency in man. Rational agency and free rational agency really express the same truth. Moral agency and free moral agency are the same. For required choices sufficient motives are within command. This is a rational freedom.

It is not the freedom of moral impotence, impotence in the very seat of the necessary potency. It is the freedom of personal agency, with power for required choices. It is sufficient for the sphere of responsible life. Spontaneous motive states often tend toward the irrational and the evil, and the more strongly in many instances from previous vicious indulgence. But as rational and moral agents we have power against them, a gracious power, indeed, through the paramount motives of prudence and wisdom and duty. We can summon into thought and reflection, and into the apprehension of conscience and the moral reason, all the counter motives of obligation and spiritual well-being, as they may arise in the view of God and redemption and the eternal destinies. With these resources of paramount motive, and the light and blessing of the Holy Spirit, ever-gracious and helpful, we may freely choose the good against the evil. This is the reality of freedom in choice.

Any scheme of volitional necessitation, whether of theology, philosophy, or materialistic evolution, must utterly deny the necessary and manifest laws and facts of our rational and moral agency.

Art. IV.—OUR GERMAN METHODISM: ITS HOPES AND DANGERS.

Occasionally the assertion is being made that German Methodism in the United States of America has attained its growth both as to numbers and efficaciousness, that the rising generation is becoming more and more Americanized and thereby drawn from her embrace; and that, therefore, this part of the Methodist Episcopal Church must necessarily suffer a gradual decline of membership, and should German immigration grow less or possibly cease, German Methodism would eventually become extinct.

It is also being remarked that German Methodism, as well as the whole Church, has lost much spiritual strength, waxed cold in love, and is less zealous and less successful in her endeavors to save immortal souls as compared with twenty-five years ago. If these assertions are based upon irrefutable facts, then the first part of our proposition, "the hopes of German Methodism," is of no avail, and a lamentation over the sorrowful facts would be in order rather than an attempt to dwell and enlarge upon the grand work God has been and is doing through the instrumentality of German Methodism among the Germans of our country. In treating a subject we are ever to bear in mind that there are "two sides to the question," and the conclusion depends very much upon the aspect from which it is viewed. He who looks through colored glass cannot behold an object in its clear light, and he who views German Methodism with a prepossessed mind or from a nativistic standpoint, cannot expect to judge soundly of the same.

Beyond doubt a serious error occurred in the administration of the affairs of the Methodist Episcopal Church at the close of the last century by rejecting Jacob Albright, as missionary to the Germans who had settled in this country. He was converted and licensed as a local preacher in 1790, and in 1796 began to itinerate among his people, believing that he was called of God to labor in their interest and to preach in the German language. He labored with great success. Many were converted and united with the Church. The Discipline was published in German, and the foundation laid for per-

manent work among his kinsmen. Mr. Albright applied to be appointed missionary by the authorities of the Church, but the objection was raised that preaching must be in English in order to Americanize the German population coming to the shores of our country. Had Mr. Albright been appointed to this special field and encouraged, as he should have been, what an ample harvest would have been prepared for the reaping of Dr. Nast and others! Not being recognized by the Church in the capacity to which Mr. Albright felt divinely called, he and his German converts were constrained to withdraw in 1807 and organize an independent Conference, which has grown into an excellent and prosperous Church, the Evangelical Association, numbering at present over one hundred thousand members.

Although Mr. Albright and his followers labored with such marked success, the steady increase of German immigration to the United States arrested the attention of Christian minds more and more. The religious state of the German population was deplorable indeed. The menacing growth of Romanism and infidelity, as well as the low moral condition of the nominally Protestant German Churches, caused alarm. Many of them were without any synodical relations, served by irresponsible and self-constituted ministers, who roved from place to place, and were in many instances outspoken rationalists. Even many of the Churches in regular standing in Lutheran and Reformed Synods were, according to reliable testimony, sunken in deep spiritual slumber. Then again, there were many German settlements throughout the country either too poor or too indifferent to connect themselves with any Church organization, living from year to year without any religious influences.

In the year 1833 Messrs. Holliday and Wright, the Western Book Agents, earnestly advocated the establishment of a German mission in the city of Cincinnati, where even then, as well as now, every third man was a German, but no suitable man could be found. In 1834 Bishop Emory, impressed with the importance of such a work, had issued, in the "Western Christian Advocate," a call for a minister able to preach in German and willing to enter upon such a mission. Just at this time, when the interest of the Church in the religious welfare of the Germans had reached its highest pitch, Dr. William Nast, the founder of German Methodism, was glori-

ously converted to God. This was on January 17, 1835. In the fall of the same year he was appointed by the Ohio Conference, into which he had been received on trial, as "German missionary in the city of Cincinnati."

The origin and growth of German Methodism, as an integral part of the Methodist Episcopal Church, may be justly pronounced as marvelous and marked by the most providential circumstances. Forty-five years ago, as we have seen, there was nothing but a poor, and, as some thought, hopeless beginning at Cincinnati. In his first year of missionary labor, which was performed under great trials and difficulties, Mr. Nast was permitted to count three clear conversions, one of them being John Zwahlen, who became a most successful Methodist preacher. At the close of the second year the first German society of the Methodist Episcopal Church consisted of twenty-six members. From this small beginning German Methodism has had a gradual increase and developed herself into a vigorous and healthy part of our great ecclesiastical body. To-day we number eight German Conferences, with 38,379 members, and 4,741 probationers, making a total membership of 43,120.

It is truly remarkable that the growth of German Methodism has not suffered a single intermission from the beginning to the present day. This is more than can be said of the parent Church. Through the O'Kelly excitement and schism, in 1792, a decrease of membership was reported of 1,035 in 1794, 6,317 in 1795, and 3,627 in 1796; making a total loss of 10,979 members in three years. In 1814 there was a decrease of 3,178, and in 1815 a decrease of 36. In 1836 a decrease of 1,840 was reported, and during the late war, from 1861 to 1864, a loss of 68,661 members was sustained. The growth of German Methodism has been a regular one. In 1847 there were 4,385 members; twenty years later, in 1867, 27,876. At the close of the next ten years, 1877, 40,515, and in 1880, 43,120 members and probationers. From the tenth to the thirtieth year the average yearly increase has been 1,174; in the next ten years, 1,264; in 1879, 1,165, and in 1880, 1,640. These figures prove conclusively that German Methodism is not in a state of decline, but enjoys a healthy increase from year to year. It may be said this is a very small yearly increase of membership among so many Germans

in this land. This is true. But we must bear in mind that the average yearly increase of the Methodist Episcopal Church has not been any greater in proportion to her numbers, opportunities, and facilities. German Methodism has not only held pace with the parent Church, but has, in some instances, outranked her, as we shall have occasion to show hereafter. Again, although German immigration has been on the decline in the last few years, (excepting in 1880,) German Methodism did not experience a corresponding falling off in accessions; indeed, the greatest increase at any one period of her existence is reported in 1875, which is 2,194 members.

In 1870 German Methodism reported 458 churches, at a probable value of $1,367,200; and 196 parsonages, valued at $246,550. In 1880, 641 churches, at a value $1,886,459; and 306 parsonages, at a probable value of $335,087. This shows an increase of 183 churches and 110 parsonages, with an increase of probable value of $607,796.

In 1870 German Methodism raised $17,234 47 for the missionary cause; in 1880, $25,097 11. In looking over the "Manual of the Methodist Episcopal Church," * we find an article entitled "A Word about Averages," in which it is shown that not a single German Conference in this country fell below an average of fifty cents a member for missions, while the total average amounts to fifty-eight cents per member. It is further said of these Conferences, "That they are not [below this high average] is due not to their pecuniary ability, but to their more thorough system in their efforts to conform *literally* to the requirements of the chapter on the support of missions in the Book of Discipline. . . . Not twenty Conferences exceed fifty cents a member, and only one, the Southern German, exceeds $1, though the East German is within a few mills of $1."

It may be proper to show, in a summary way, the amounts contributed by German Methodism last year:

Missionary collections.....	$25,097	Average per member.....			$0 58
Other collections.....	31,938	"	"	.....	74
Sunday-schools.....	20,280	"	"	.....	47
Current expenses.....	29,224	"	"	.....	68
Payment on debts.....	39,203	"	"	.....	91
New buildings, etc.....	78,755	"	"	.....	1 82
Preachers' salaries.....	252,038	"	"	.....	5 85
Total.....	$476,535	Total average per member.			$11 05

* Vol. i, No. 2, p. 80.

This is, indeed, a good showing for the benevolence of German Methodism, especially if we take into consideration that but few members can be called wealthy. It is the laboring man who, after providing for a large family, still has a surplus for the Lord's corn-house.

Again: The Sunday-school work of German Methodism has also been blessed with signal success in the last decade. In 1870 there were reported 518 Sunday-schools, 5,267 officers and teachers, 27,937 scholars, and 63,628 library books.

In 1880 there were 777 Sunday-schools, 8,212 officers and teachers, 41,301 scholars, 64,669 library books, and 1,416 conversions reported in Sunday-schools. German Methodism is most zealously engaged in the Sunday-school work and catechetical instruction of her youth. Dr. Henry Liebhart, editor of German Sunday-school publications and tracts, has well said:* "Earnestness, thoroughness, and simplicity are the characteristics of the schools. The German Sunday-school workers have only one aim in view, namely, the conversion and edification of the scholars. To achieve this the best approved methods are employed, no time being squandered with doubtful experiments or discussions of new theories. The International Lesson System is universally introduced, and has proved a blessing to German schools. It operates admirably well in every respect, and has by no means been a hinderance to catechetical instruction; for the German Methodists are working out the only true theory in regard to the Catechism, holding that it is not enough to teach it in the Sunday-schools, but demanding of their pastors that their children shall receive regular and thorough catechetical instruction, at set hours during the week, and the German Methodist preachers perform this duty faithfully and gladly, because they are deeply convinced of the great importance and immense value of such instruction." In order to facilitate the German Sunday-school work, Dr. Liebhart organized ten Sunday-school districts throughout the bounds of German Methodism, in which he conducts Sunday-school Conferences at regular intervals. Of these meetings it can be said that they have become established institutions of German Methodism, exerting a good influence, inspiring the workers, spreading instruction, introducing new

* "Manual of the Methodist Episcopal Church," vol. i, No. 1, p. 30.

methods, and stimulating the interest in the cause generally. The Chautauqua plan has also been introduced, and a German literary society organized, which is a branch of the Chautauqua Literary and Scientific Circle, and began operations in October, 1880.

In educational matters German Methodism has followed in the footsteps of the parent Church. Already four institutions of learning have been established and are in successful operation in the United States. Thus far German Methodists have shown commendable liberality to all these institutions. Ninety per cent. of all moneys expended for them has been paid by German Methodists, only ten per cent. coming from the English-speaking people. The biblical department of the German Wallace College, of Berea, Ohio, has been especially successful. During twenty years past eighty of its students have entered the German ministry of the Church, and many others are already occupying honorable positions in other professions. German Methodism has the honor of establishing the first orphan asylum of the Methodist Episcopal Church, upon which God's blessing has signally rested. The Church periodicals and Sunday-school literature are in a prosperous condition. The "Christliche Apologete," with an increase of size and subscribers, is doing a noble work for German Methodism in inculcating Methodist doctrines, and in the advocacy of all the institutions of the Church. "Haus und Herd" is proving a success and meeting a demand of German readers, and the "Sunday-School Bell" is not only a favorite among German Methodists, but is joyfully received in many non-Methodistic families and Sunday-schools.

But let us take a view of the spiritual condition and inner life of German Methodism. The old maxim of Wesleyan Methodism, "Holiness of heart and life," is not only still adhered to, but has of late taken a greater and deeper hold upon the minds and hearts of German Methodists. The doctrine of full salvation through the blood of Jesus Christ is preached and believed, professed and carried out in practical life. On the great question of temperance German Methodism occupies a clear and most decided position.

The same can be said of the observance of the Sabbath-day. There are more camp-meetings, basket-meetings, holiness and

Sunday-school conventions being held from year to year. We have, perhaps, less great and shouting revivals than at the beginning of German Methodism, nevertheless, the work done is deep and of permanent results; there are but few backsliders among those who once embraced religion, and in knowledge of God's word, Christian experience, systematic beneficence, and godly life, German Methodism of to-day is equal to any former period.

Again, it is objected that German Methodism has lost its characteristic stamp of plainness and simplicity, as well as outward influence upon the world. But we must bear in mind that the commercial and social conditions of the people of our country have undergone a material alteration in the last twenty years. This digression, therefore, is not so much due to the change of German Methodism as it is to the change of the surrounding circumstances.

That German Methodism has suffered a loss in regard to her influence upon the masses, we doubt very much. It is to be remembered, in the first place, that she never was very successful in drawing large numbers from the classes of the so-called higher educated, from the wealthy, or from the beer and whisky venders and consumers; her influence and success has always been limited to the middle classes. Secondly, German Protestantism was in former years in too low a spiritual condition to offer the hungering masses of Germans any food for their souls. A revival was an unheard-of thing in almost any German Protestant Church forty or fifty years ago. The greatest number of accessions to the Church in Cincinnati and other places, at any one time, consisted chiefly of members from other denominations, which to-day are supplied with pious men and successful ministers who understand how to build up their respective congregations. Thirdly, the German, therefore, coming to the United States to-day, and seeking a home and shelter for his soul, where he may enjoy heartfelt Christianity and religious fellowship, can, in many instances, find the same in his own Church, without being constrained to change his Church relations, as was often the case in former years.

That some of our congregations, in the larger cities, both East and West, have numerically decreased, can be accounted

for in a rational way. As for example, we will look at Cincinnati, Ohio, the cradle of German Methodism. There is hardly a congregation to be found in the Middle or Western States without a representative of Cincinnati among the membership. The Church records of our three congregations show that no less than three thousand members moved from Cincinnati. In this manner our congregations at New York, Cincinnati, St. Louis, and Chicago supplied the seed for a number of congregations throughout the entire country.

It has also been said, that in course of time the German language would die out in the United States, that the children of German Methodists are becoming Americanized to such an extent and rapid degree that German Methodism has no future, and that its increase depended entirely upon German immigration.

The first assertion is older than our century. This objection was made, as we have seen, to Mr. Jacob Albright's desire to be appointed by the authorities of the Church as missionary to the Germans. It was Bishop Asbury's opinion, one hundred years ago, that the German language in the State of Pennsylvania would soon die out. The history of the colonization of the United States proves conclusively that a foreign language can be carried into another country and there flourish for generations. For almost two hundred years the German language has held its own in the State of Pennsylvania, and that, too, without new immigration or German literature to any great extent. The same is true of the German colonies in Brazil, South America, of the Mennonites in slavish Russia, of the French in English Canada, and of the Hollanders in South Africa. The German language is to-day stronger and more extensively used in the United States than at any former period; it is introduced into quite a number of public schools, and receives continually more strength by the flood of German immigration which is pouring into our land. In the month of June, 1880, no less than 45,000 German immigrants landed in our different sea-ports. The city of New York has a population of 150,000 immigrated Germans, Chicago over 80,000, St. Louis over 60,000, and Cincinnati over 50,000. Multiplying these numbers by three, we have 450,000 Germans in New York city, 240,000 in Chicago, 180,000 in St. Louis, and

150,000 in Cincinnati. Will there be less in numbers in ten, twenty, or thirty years hence?

German language and German literature are a felt and recognized power in the United States. In cities, as well as in the country, German immigrants flock together. Cincinnati has her "over the Rhine," and all larger cities have their German quarters, where German language and customs are freely used. Germany, the land of literature in an eminent sense of the word, the land of philosophical thinking, of scientific and historic research, of the most radical and bold criticism, and of modern unbelief, is supplying the Germans of this country with the most extensive literature. The "*Gartenlaube*," a materialistic periodical of Germany, for instance, exports eighty thousand copies of each issue to the United States. These facts prove that the German language is alive and growing in our land, and that German Methodism has a great work to accomplish in spreading scriptural holiness among the German population. The youth of German Methodism, in some instances, it is true, is becoming Americanized and is drifting away from the Church. In most cases, however, these are such that have become alienated from Christianity to such a degree that they seek society in the world rather than in an English-speaking congregation. As a rule, German Methodism holds her youth. They are taught the German Bible and Catechism. They are indoctrinated into Methodism through the medium of the German language, and although they often appear very much Americanized in business life and in society, in their religion, however, they are decidedly German. All technical terms and expressions of a biblical discourse are more familiar to them and more readily understood in their mother tongue, though they may talk the queen's English ever so fluently. This accounts for the fact that the writer of these lines has had but two applications for a letter of recommendation in a sixteen-years' itineraney, to be presented to English congregations. There are many congregations throughout German Methodism where but a small per cent. of her youth is lost from her embrace on account of the German language.

In viewing German Methodism, in the light of its history, development, present condition, and results obtained, we are entitled to the conclusion that the outlook into the future is a

hopeful and promising one. Methodism is a revival of earnest and primitive Christianity, and this is as much needed among our German population as at other places where all is spiritually dead. The doctrines of Methodism are drawn directly from the Bible; that is its real and not merely theoretical standard of faith, and that is what the Germans of this country pre-eminently need. German Methodism is no doubtful experiment of the parent Church, but an established fact. It is no passing shade upon the ecclesiastical dominion, but a power felt and making itself known more and more in saving souls as brands plucked from the eternal burnings, and as long as the German language shall be known and used as a means of speech, so long will German Methodism continue its God-given mission.

What, then, are the dangers threatening German Methodism? Church history informs us that, from the beginning, two formidable foes did much harm to the Church of Christ, namely, heresy and secularization. In regard to the first-named foe, heresy, we cannot perceive any danger for German Methodism. It is, indeed, a significant fact, that there has been no division among Methodists in Europe or America on questions of doctrine. The doctrines of Methodism are popular with the German Methodists, because they approve themselves to the mind and heart. Free grace, universal atonement, personal responsibility, salvation by faith, witness of the Spirit, and perfect love, are, and will ever be, popular Scripture doctrines, because they are clearly taught in the Bible, and the German Methodist believes them most heartily. As to the economy of the Methodist Episcopal Church, German Methodists are truly loyal. They believe not only in the doctrines of Holy Scripture as set forth in the articles of religion of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but they are also cheerfully willing to be governed by the rules of the same.

The chief danger threatening German Methodism can be expressed by the term secularization. This has ever been a great hinderance in promoting the religion of Jesus Christ. In almost every instance where the Christian Church succeeded in setting aside heresy and accommodating differences arising out of one-sidedness or narrowness of views, secularization stealthily crept into its clergy and laity, doing great damage to

the cause of Christ. The immediate result of secularization is indifferentism and dead formalism. This is the pestilence that walketh in darkness, and the destruction that wasteth at noonday. The apostles of Christ had to battle with this foe in the different Churches they established, and the Roman Church of the mediæval age was thoroughly penetrated by it. Although Luther, together with other reformers, succeeded in giving this enemy a great blow, and to diffuse new life into the Church through the great work of Reformation they, under the guidance of God, carried out; nevertheless it is secularization, with all its consequences, which to-day has laid Christianity in Germany so low, doing, in many instances, more direct and immediate harm to God's cause than outspoken infidelity. And to-day it is secularization of the nominal Christians in the heathen world which greatly impedes the progress and work of evangelizing these dark lands.

In this direction, then, we descry danger for German Methodism, as well as for Christianity at large. What we need is more extended personal religious activity among preachers and members, promoted and utilized by the various means of grace in use and methods of operation, a holding fast to the spiritual life, the doctrines, the economy, the liberality and active benevolence of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which are, indeed, suited to the Germans as well as to all classes of mankind.

German Methodism has a great task to perform in America as well as in Germany, in spreading scriptural holiness among those who are sunken in infidelity and rationalism, indifferentism and formalism, and in provoking the sister denominations to a more thorough and extended effort of Christian labor for immortal souls. A great work is being done in Germany. Already we number 68 itinerant preachers, 59 local preachers, 2,444 full members, 2,377 probationers, 372 Sunday-schools, 1,322 officers and teachers, and 18,716 Sunday-school scholars. A great future evidently lies before Methodism in Germany. Religious liberty now prevails through nearly all the German Empire and Switzerland, and a large increase of Methodism in Germany may be looked for in the next ten years. Not a few German immigrants coming to America are already in full sympathy with German Methodism and heartily enter into its ranks.

The success of German Methodism in the future depends upon a pentecostal anointing, which will increase the spirituality, strengthen the zeal for the right, give courage and vigor against sin, and multiply the work of conversions of souls, and the sanctification of believers. May the whole Church be imbued with this power!

Art. V.—THE RELATIONS OF THE CHURCHES AND MR. GARRISON TO THE AMERICAN ANTISLAVERY MOVEMENT.

[Second Article.]

III. *The period of intense and more decisive organized effort*, (1832–63,) from the organization of the New England Antislavery Society, January 6, 1832, to the consummation of emancipation, under the proclamation of President Lincoln, January 1, 1863.

Mr. William Lloyd Garrison was confessedly a conspicuous actor in this period. His advent into public life was at an opportune moment. While many friends of the slave were waiting and praying for some providential way to be opened for the liberation of the oppressed multitudes, Mr. Garrison reached manhood, and caught inspiration from the examples of the English antislavery reformers, brilliant with omens of approaching success. On January 1, 1831, he issued the first number of the "Liberator," and three years and a half later emancipation was an accomplished fact in the British West Indies. Under the influence of such inspiring events Mr. Garrison boldly proclaimed his distinctive thesis of immediate and unconditional emancipation. Following in the wake of British antislavery reformers, and ignoring the radical difference in the constitutional possibilities of the two governments, he uncompromisingly, severely, and bitterly maintained a line of antislavery action, which necessarily separated many good, discreet men from affiliation with him.

It was impossible for them to see any way in which immediate and unconditional emancipation could be effected. They deemed his policy unwise and impracticable, hurtful and perilous to the best interests of the slave. But, with him, to us

non-Garrisonian was to be pro-slavery, deserving of implacable denunciation. We shall see him ofttimes practically working against the cause he sought to promote.

But even the Garrisonian antislavery societies grew out of the religious sentiment and the Churches. Nearly all of the twelve persons who organized the New England Antislavery Society, in January, 1832, were members of the Evangelical Churches. From the pen of Mr. Oliver Johnson,* the youngest of them all, then an editor of a religious paper, a member of Dr. Beecher's Church, and a candidate for the ministry, we learn the religious relations of each. Robert B. Hall was a theological student, and a member of the Essex-street Congregational Church. Arnold Buffom, the first president of the society, was a Rhode Island Quaker, who had traveled in England, and was acquainted with Clarkson and Wilberforce. William J. Snelling was a journalist. John E. Fuller was a business man, and a member of Dr. Beecher's Church. Moses Thatcher was the editor of the Boston "Telegraph," and pastor of the Congregational Church at North Wrentham. Joshua Coffin was the gentleman honored in Whittier's lines, "To my old School-master." Stillman J. Newcomb was an earnest religious man. Benjamin C. Bacon was a religious young man, *employé* in the office of the American Education Society. Isaac Knapp was Mr. Garrison's partner in publishing the "Liberator." Henry K. Stockton was a printer by trade, connected with the Boston "Telegraph." Nearly all were religious men connected with Evangelical Churches.

Mr. Garrison's religious position at that time deserves fuller notice. His later religious views having undergone considerable change, and excited diverse inquiries and comments, it is a matter of considerable interest to state in detail his earlier religious convictions, under the influence of which he entered upon this great movement.

Those who knew him well, in his earlier years, have said that he possessed a nature deeply religious, "a positive genius for ethics," unusual keenness of moral perception, an invincible moral courage, and "sympathy for the unfortunate that scorned the limitations of race, color, or clime." On coming to Boston, in 1826, at the age of twenty-one years, he was recognized as

* "Christian Union," August 12, 1874.

soundly orthodox, and was a devout worshiper in Dr. Lyman Beecher's Church. He was not a communicant, but had great reverence for God, for Christ, and the institutions of Christianity. "His views," says Oliver Johnson, "were neither Rationalistic nor Liberal, but soundly orthodox. The Bible was his constant companion, the armory from which he drew the weapons of his warfare. No clergyman or theological professor was more familiar with the Old Testament or the New than he was. The Hebrew prophets, Christ and his Apostles were his model reformers, and his faith in God and the moral law was scarcely inferior to theirs." *

His interpretation of Christianity was eminently orthodox, and he relied upon revivals of religion as the hopeful instrumentalities for the liberation of the slaves. In 1831 he declared, in the "Liberator," that "nothing but extensive revivals of pure religion could save the country from great plagues and sudden destruction;" that religious conversions are scriptural occurrences; that "the kingdoms of this world can never become 'the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ' independently of great revivals;" that "if the present revivals be (as we trust they are) the fruit of the Holy Spirit, we pray that they may embrace the nation," etc.

Mr. Garrison was also at this time a strict observer of the Sabbath,† and "would no sooner have gone to the post-office

* In the "Liberator," (April 12, 1831,) he said: "*The Bible! The Bible!* how shall we subdue the obdurate heart, and awaken the seared conscience, and successfully impeach the criminal conduct of slave owners; how shall we operate upon public opinion, and call into vigorous exercise the moral energies of the nation, and establish justice throughout our borders, and break down the middle walls of partition which separate man from his fellow-men; how shall we preach deliverance to the captives, and the opening of the prison doors to them that are bound, and transform the benighted and suffering slave into an enlightened and happy freeman, and the haughty master into a familiar friend—how shall we accomplish this, and more, without the Bible? . . . Take away the Bible, and our warfare with oppression and infidelity and intemperance and impurity and crime is at an end; our weapons are wrested away, our foundation is removed; we have no authority to speak, no courage to act."

† In the "Liberator," in 1831, appeared the following sonnet from his pen:

"THE SABBATH-DAY.

"Faint prototype of Heaven, blest Sabbath-day!
Emblem of an eternal rest to come;
Emancipator from vile Mammon's sway,
At whose approach a noisy world is dumb;

for his letters and papers, or taken a walk for recreation on that day, than he would have committed a theft."

His antislavery career was the legitimate outcome of a heart profoundly stirred with deep religious convictions, and all his early compeers derived their impulse from the same source. New laborers, inspired by the same feelings, came forth through the successive years of this great agitation, representing the piety and the philanthropy of pure Christianity.

Under the leadership of prominent representatives of the Churches other antislavery societies and several antislavery papers were soon started. The "Emancipator" was established in New York city, in March, 1833, by Hon. Arthur Tappan, under the editorial supervision of Rev. Charles W. Dennison. In October following, in response to a call issued by Rev. Joshua Leavitt, the New York City Antislavery Society was organized; and on December 4 the American Antislavery Society, in Philadelphia, the latter holding its first anniversary meeting May 6, 1834, in the Chatham-street Chapel, N. Y. In June, 1835, the New England Wesleyan Antislavery Society was organized in Lynn, Mass., by about seventy ministers of the New England Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The following month the New Hampshire Conference of the same Church organized a similar society. These are a few of the leading societies constituted at this early period, and which, in the course of eight years, numbered more than two thousand, with two hundred thousand members. Of the persons participating in the organization of the American Antislavery Society and in its first anniversary, more than one third were ministers of the Gospel, and two thirds of the remainder were either lay officials or private members of the Churches. As early as 1832, Rev. Beriah Greek, Professor of Sacred Literature in Western Reserve College, Ohio, published four stirring antislavery sermons; and in 1833 Rev. Elizur Wright, another

> Unerring regulator, sacred pledge;
> Best friend and soother of the poor and weak;
> A resting-place in our drear pilgrimage,
> Where soul and body may refreshment seek;
> If thou were blotted out, our moral sun,
> The huge eclipse would dress the world in gloom;
> Confusion dire would seize on every one,
> And peace, love, order, find a hasty tomb;
> Then would oppression reign, then lust rebel,
> Then violence abound, and earth resemble hell!"

professor in that institution, published a powerful essay against slavery.

The first antislavery meetings encountered violent opposition. Hissing, mobs, peltings, personal abuse, and social ostracism followed the reformers. The New York City Antislavery Society was driven from its place of meeting, and the celebration by the American Antislavery Society, on July 4, 1834, was broken up. The house of Lewis Tappan was sacked, and the churches and homes of colored people were assaulted and damaged. In August, 1834, a fearful riot raged three nights in Philadelphia, and similar outrages were perpetrated elsewhere. Cruel and dastardly assaults were made upon Abolitionists, countenanced, and often excited by men of position and wealth, and sometimes by members of Churches. The public journals were vehicles of scandalous accusations against the reformers, misrepresenting their purposes, motives, and acts. Churches and public halls alike were often closed against them, and they were made to feel that they held property and liberty, if not life itself, at the mercy of excited, lawless men. It was, indeed, a reign of terror. Rev. Orange Scott, a presiding elder in the Methodist Episcopal Church, while delivering an antislavery address in Worcester, Mass., August 10, 1835, was assaulted, and his notes seized and torn to pieces by a mob, led by a son of an ex-governor of the Commonwealth. In the same year Rev. George Storrs, another Methodist minister, while lecturing in New Hampshire, was arrested by a deputy sheriff, on the charge of being "a common rioter and brawler." Soon after, at another antislavery meeting, he was again arrested and dragged from his knees, while Rev. Mr. Curtis was in prayer. A meeting of an antislavery society, composed of some of the most cultured ladies in Boston, was broken up in October, 1835, by a mob composed of "gentlemen of property and standing," the mayor and marshal declining protection. On the same day Mr. Garrison was seized, led with a rope around his neck, and his clothes were torn from his body. The mayor * finally interposed, rescued him, and lodged him

* In 1837, Massachusetts' most classic orator and governor warned the abolitionists that the agitation of the slavery question would be regarded as "an offence against the peace of the Commonwealth, which might be prosecuted as a misdemeanor at common law."

in jail to save him from fury. These are a few of a long series of outrages, in which the mobbing of Hon. George Thompson, the eminent English philanthropist, the assassination of Lovejoy and Bewley, and the martyrdom of Torrey and John Brown were conspicuous.

The action of the Churches and the ministry during this period has been severely censured. The clergy were accused of backwardness, and even positive opposition. It was said that some had to be dragged into the service, if they rendered any aid. In the autumn of 1830 Mr. Garrison made several efforts to obtain a church * or a hall in Boston in which to deliver three free antislavery addresses. After many unsuccessful personal applications, he advertised in the "Courier," but no Church in Boston responded to his appeal. This was before the publication of the "Liberator," and fifteen months before the New England Antislavery Society was organized. Mr. Garrison's religious views were not then distrusted, but he was known to be "soundly orthodox," and a regular worshiper at Dr. Lyman Beecher's Church. Failing to obtain a church, a society of avowed infidels, organized in Boston by Abner Kneeland, having control of Julien Hall, in Milk-street, offered it gratuitously to Mr. Garrison, and it was thankfully accepted.

But this was only the beginning of a long series of adverse movements by religious bodies, against this great reform. Many Christian men of positive antislavery principles turned their backs upon the Garrison societies, while others filled their mouths with apologies for slaveholding, and others still stoutly and learnedly defended the institution from the Bible. The Protestant Episcopal Bishop of a New England diocese belonged to the latter class. Another, the president of a New England college, declared that slavery was not only a positive institution of revealed religion, but also compatible with the law of love. A Boston minister, visiting the South for his health, pictured slavery in a rose-colored hue, and a learned theological professor, in a treatise, called the higher-law doctrine a heresy, and advocated the duty of returning slaves to

* *Per contra*, it may be said that Jesse Lee and other early Methodist preachers could not obtain the use of churches for religious services. For several successive weeks he sought in vain to get a church to preach in, in Boston.

bondage. The moral jargon increased, and the opposition grew fiercer, hotter, and more implacable.

The American Churches became deeply stirred, and appropriate action was taken in many Conferences and Associations, while in others the action was sometimes reprehensible.

The Friends, who inherited and cherished their earlier antislavery testimony as a precious legacy from their fathers, after the Missouri Compromise contest, in common with other Churches, felt the general stupor, and were disinclined to attack slavery. This spirit manifested itself particularly among wealthy Friends engaged in the manufacture or sale of cotton, and in other commercial pursuits. "The Quakers in New England," said Oliver Johnson, "as a body, instead of welcoming the antislavery movement and giving it encouragement, set themselves firmly but insidiously against it, generally refusing to open their meeting-houses for antislavery lectures, preventing their members, as far as possible, from uniting with the antislavery society, and sometimes dismissing those who were independent enough to co-operate with the Abolitionists." There were honorable individual exceptions. But many of those included in Mr. Johnson's censure were persons whose only fault was that they did not pronounce the Garrisonian shibboleth.

The Congregational Churches, wholly a northern body, and consequently without ecclesiastical entanglements with the South in any organic form, were embarrassed and often seriously compromised by the influence of prominent members engaged in the manufacture of cotton, or connected with slavery, in commercial, social, or political relations. Nevertheless, it was well represented in the struggle. Revs. Amos A. Phelps, of Boston; William Goodell and Joshua Leavitt, of New York city; S. S. Jocelyn, of New Haven; and David Thurston, of Maine, were in the antislavery field as early as 1833, attending and actively participating in the organization of the American Antislavery Society in Philadelphia, in December of that year. Rev. Mr. Thurston was for many years one of its agents, and Rev. Messrs. Phelps, Leavitt, and Goodell, were editors and agents for many years, in the service of antislavery societies. As early as 1837, fully one third of the Congregational ministers in Massachusetts were enrolled members of antislavery societies.

"The antislavery society in Amherst College, in 1834, had 76 members, of whom 70 were professors of religion; 30 of them had consecrated themselves to the foreign missionary work, and 20 to home missionary service in the West. In 1834 the trustees of Lane Seminary (Cincinnati) prohibited the open discussion of slavery by the students, and four fifths of the students withdrew from the institution. A number of them, including Theodore D. Weld,* Henry B. Stanton, and Ichabod Codding, became at once antislavery lecturers, and went from State to State defending the rights of the slave. The breaking up of the classes in Lane Seminary led to the organization of the theological department at Oberlin, and in this great reform Oberlin took an early and prominent part. Mr. Finney refused to become president of a college unless colored students were allowed to enjoy its privileges. The Hon. Salmon P. Chase was wont to ascribe his elevation to the United States Senate to the influence of Oberlin.†

"So far as Congregationalism is concerned," says the editor of the "Congregational Quarterly," it should be remembered that the leading Garrisonians, Henry C. Wright, Parker Pillsbury, and Stephen S. Foster, imbibed their antislavery sentiments, but not their fanaticism, from Congregational sources, for they were originally Congregational ministers or candidates for that office. . . . I freely acknowledge that the Church did not do its whole duty. In our own denomination the prominent ministers, particularly, seemed to be unduly subject to commercial influences. Still the true picture, although it has dark shades, is luminous and attractive."‡

The Free-will Baptists, located almost entirely in the North, kept clear of the evil, and were decided in their protests against it, on account of which the New Hampshire Legislature, for many years an ultra-Democratic body, refused to grant an act of incorporation for their publishing house.

* While Mr. Weld was holding a series of meetings in Steubenville, Ohio, he noticed a young lawyer in his audience, evening after evening, taking notes. At the close of his last lecture the young man came forward and introduced himself, remarking, "I came here resolved to answer you, and have taken notes of every lecture; but you have converted me." That young lawyer was Edwin M. Stanton, and thus God raised up for Mr. Lincoln's administration a fit Secretary of War.

† "Congregational Quarterly," 1876, p. 554. ‡ Ibid., p. 553.

The Protestant Episcopal Church, extending through the South, every-where maintained extremely conservative ground. Through all the antislavery agitations, and even during the late Civil War, her ministry, in their pulpits and ecclesiastical assemblies, studiously avoided the question of slavery, and all politico-religious matters. As the result, a considerable number of conservative, "South-side" politicians, disturbed by what was stigmatized as "political preaching" in other denominations, united with that Church, which tended to make it still more conservative.

The action of two other large denominations will be sketched more at length. The Presbyterian Church had many sharp contests on this question. In 1833 the Synod of Kentucky, after discussing for two days, with much spirit, a resolution declaring slavery within its bounds a great moral evil, inconsistent with the word of God, indefinitely postponed the subject; whereupon Rev. R. J. Breckenridge left the house, declaring, "Since God has forsaken the Synod of Kentucky, Robert J. Breckenridge will forsake it, too." The following year an able committee was directed to prepare a plan for the instruction and future emancipation of slaves. They reported the next year, recommending gradual emancipation. But the committee were in advance of the Synod, and their report failed of approval. Under what was characterized as "Northern aggressions," "inflammatory periodicals," etc., a reaction set in, and the prospects of emancipation became less hopeful. Slave laws were made more stringent, and Sabbath-schools for the slaves were suspended.

The subject of slavery was brought to the attention of the Presbyterian General Assembly in 1836, by the report of a committee, appointed the previous year to consider certain petitions and memorials. The majority recommended that no action be taken on the subject. The minority report proposed certain resolutions strongly opposed to slavery. After a variety of motions and propositions, the whole subject was indefinitely postponed by a vote of one hundred and fifty-six yeas to eighty-seven nays. Twenty-eight members protested against the decision. The excitement was very great during the debates.*

* "History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States," by Rev. E. H. Gillett, D.D., vol. ii, p. 524.

Very decided expressions followed this session of the Assembly, by the Southern press and the Southern Presbyteries. A member of the Assembly, in the Southern "Religious Telegraph," said, "I hope that another such Assembly will never meet but once again, and then only with full and delegated powers amicably to separate," the editor adding, "A crisis has come; if there can be no compromise, division must be tried." The Presbytery of Concord, N. C., said, "Rather than surrender the truth or perpetuate the present distracting agitation, we shall feel bound to submit to a division of the Church." The Presbytery of South Carolina said, "The parties ought to separate;" the Synod of Virginia said, "One thing that presses with peculiar force on the Presbyterian Church in the South is the spirit of abolition;" and the Charleston Union Presbytery (S. C.) declared that, "As the relation of master and slave is a civil institution, it is one on which the Church has no power to legislate."

A purely ecclesiastical question, in regard to the benevolent "boards" of the Church, with which the slavery question became complicated, hindered and embarrassed their action. A compromise quieted the South and prevented a rupture; but it was accomplished on the humiliating condition that slavery was no more to be allowed to disturb the General Assembly. Thus the South for some years shaped the policy of the Church.*

Subsequently the agitation was renewed. Year after year memorials and overtures were presented, eliciting warm and extended discussion, and resulting in action which failed to satisfy the more zealous antislavery men of the North, and excited dissatisfaction at the South. The antislavery sentiment of the Church was increasing, as was evident from the utterances of the General Assembly; but its official action, under the preponderating desire for unity, continually exposed it to criticism from radical reformers at the North and from apologists for slavery at the South.

In 1853 it was felt that "the Church" must come unto some unity with itself on the question of slavery. In response to overtures, both from the North and the South, the

* "History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States," by Rev. E. H. Gillett, D.D., vol. ii, pp. 526, 527.

Assembly proposed that the facts concerning the relation of the Southern Churches to slavery should be reported the next year; but the measure was denounced as inquisitorial. In 1856 a committee, appointed the previous year, reported on the constitutional power of the General Assembly over slave-holding in the Churches under their care, which, though adopted after a prolonged discussion, was offensive to Southern members. The South complained; and in 1857 the Presbytery of Lexington, Ky., gave official notice to the Assembly that many members of its Churches, as well as a number of its ministers and elders, held slaves "from principle" and "of choice," believing it to be right according to the Bible, and the Presbytery itself sustained them in their position. Had the Assembly desired, it was no longer possible to evade the issue. By a vote of one hundred and sixty-nine yeas to twenty-six nays, a report was adopted, which presented a summary history of the action of the successive Assemblies on the subject of slavery, and which "disapproved and earnestly condemned" the position of the Presbytery of Lexington, as opposed to the established convictions of the Church, and tending to mar its peace, seriously hinder its prosperity, and bring reproach upon Christianity. The report also called upon the Presbytery to review and rectify their position because "such doctrines and practice" could not "be permanently tolerated in the Presbyterian Church." Twenty-two members, representing the Southern Churches, and identifying their own case with the Lexington Presbytery, protested that this action "degraded the whole Southern Church," and was "the virtual exscinding of the South." Returning home, the protestants were sustained by their Presbyteries, and the result was the withdrawal of the Southern Churches under the care of the Assembly, and the formation of the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church. "Thus," says Dr. Gillett, "before political convulsions had occurred to rend the Church *through the State*, the body represented by the Constitutional General Assembly had defined its position, had attained internal harmony, and had thrown off an incubus, which, for years, had oppressed and crippled its energies." *

* "History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States," by Rev. E. H. Gillett, D.D., vol. ii, pp. 555–559.

This division was soon followed by another. A very considerable portion of the strength of the Presbyterian Church was within the limits of those States which seceded from the Federal Union in 1861; and "upon the Assembly of that year the long-deferred question pressed with the weight of an avalanche." The Assembly indicated its loyalty by appropriate resolutions, declaring its repugnance to a rebellion instituted in the interest of slavery, which were passed by a vote of one hundred and fifty-six yeas to sixty-six nays. The result was the secession of the Southern Churches and Presbyteries, and the formation of the Southern General Assembly.

The first movements against slavery in the Methodist Episcopal Church, in this period, were made in the New England and New Hampshire Conferences, under the leadership of Rev. Orange Scott in the former, and Rev. George Storrs in the latter. When Rev. Wilbur Fisk, D.D., in the New England Conference, in June, 1834, offered resolutions in favor of the Colonization Society, Mr. Scott moved to lay them on the table, which was carried after a stormy debate. In January, 1835, Mr. Scott commenced a long series of articles on slavery in the "Zion's Herald," (Boston;) and, on the 4th of February following, an "Appeal" to the Church on the subject of slavery appeared in the same paper, over the signatures of LeRoy Sunderland, Orange Scott, Abram D. Merrill, Shipley W. Wilson, George Storrs, and Jared Perkins. On the 8th of April a "Counter Appeal" appeared, written by Rev. D. D. Whedon, and signed by Wilbur Fisk, John Lindsey, Bartholomew Otheman, Hezekiah S. Ramsdell, Edward T. Taylor, Abel Stevens, Jacob Sanborn, and H. H. White. In June the New England and New Hampshire Conferences organized antislavery societies,* and made arrangements to circulate Wesley's "Thoughts on Slavery," and other documents. Thus was re-opened the antislavery agitation in the Methodist Episcopal Church.

* By invitation, the Hon. George Thompson, an English Wesleyan local preacher, preached a powerful sermon before the New England Conference, from Ezek. xxviii, 14–16. The North Bennett-street Methodist Episcopal Church was opened to Mr. Thompson, on fast day, for a sermon; and also for a meeting of the Ladies' Antislavery Society, which Mr. Thompson addressed; which acts, at a time when Mr. Thompson was every-where denounced, were highly commended in the "Liberator."

Then followed, in rapid succession, a long series of exciting events: the address of fourteen Baltimore ministers, and the report of the Ohio and Kentucky Conferences, disapproving of abolitionism; the address of Bishops Hedding and Emory, September 10, 1835, to the ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church within the bounds of the New England and New Hampshire Conferences, expressing great solicitude on account of the excitement occasioned by agitating the subject of "immediate emancipation;" the address of Dr. Wilbur Fisk, one of the purest and best constituted minds in the Church, on the eve of his departure for Europe, in a similar style; the establishment of "Zion's Watchman," in New York city, January 1, 1836, devoted especially to the cause of abolition, with LeRoy Sunderland as editor; the resolutions of the Baltimore and New York Conferences, strongly condemning abolition and the "Watchman;" the presentation to the General Conference, at Cincinnati, (May, 1836,) of petitions from New England signed by 200 ministers and 2,284 laymen, praying for action against slavery; the censuring, by that body, of two of its members for attending and addressing an abolition meeting in Cincinnati; the passage of a resolution disclaiming any "right, wish, or intention to interfere with the civil and political relation between master and slave, as it exists;" the attempt of the Southern members to elect a slaveholding Bishop, contrary to the established policy of the Church; the exciting scenes in 1837 over the slavery question, at the New England and the New Hampshire Conferences, and in Methodist antislavery conventions held in Utica and Cazenovia, N. Y., and Lynn, Mass.; the action of the New York Conference, the following year, calling to account two of its members for attending the Utica Convention; the issuing of the "Wesleyan Quarterly Review," in 1838, by Rev. Orange Scott, for the fuller discussion of antislavery questions, and Mr. Scott's arraignment, by Bishop Hedding, at the following session of the New England Conference in Boston; the arraignment of LeRoy Sunderland, by Rev. Dr. Nathan Bangs, for a similar cause; the discussion of the famous "Plan of Pacification" and questions of "Conference Rights," in 1838 and 1839; the extreme pro-slavery utterances of Southern Conferences, declaring that "slavery, as it now exists in these United

States, is not a moral evil;" and the starting of the "American Wesleyan Observer," a new antislavery paper, in Lowell, Mass., Nov. 7, 1839, edited by Revs. Jotham Horton and Orange Scott.

These events, occurring between 1834 and 1840, show the intense aggressive spirit of opposition to slavery in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the no less determined resistance to antislavery action by Southerners and Southern sympathizers. During these six years the Church was agitated by the most exciting contests ever known in her history. The South threatened to divide the Church, and many at the North, fearing it, sought to avert the calamity. But the antislavery sentiment steadily increased.

The General Conference of 1840 was in harmony with that of 1836—the last of the retrograding series, where the downward tendency of conservatism touched bottom. The action of the Missouri Conference, condemning a minister of maladministration for receiving the testimony of colored persons against white persons, in a church trial, was approved; and, by a vote of seventy-four to thirty-six, this Conference declared that "such a practice is inexpedient and unjustifiable in those States where colored persons are not allowed to testify in trials at law." But the most remarkable action was taken upon a memorial from Westmoreland, Va. The Conference affirmed that ownership of slave-property, in States and Territories where the laws do not admit of emancipation or permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom, constitutes no legal barrier to the election and ordination of ministers to the various grades of office known in the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and cannot, therefore, be considered as operating any forfeiture of right, in view of such election and ordination.

These concessions, contrary to the time-honored policy of the Church, aroused attention, and augmented the immense antislavery force in process of development within and without the ecclesiastical lines. The tide turned in 1840, after which no more concessions were made to the slave power. The "Wesleyan" schism, in 1842, in which about twenty traveling elders and five thousand members seceded, chiefly on account of the relation of the Church to slavery, contributed somewhat to this end.

When the General Conference met, in 1844, it found on its hands a great question to settle—whether the Bishops should be allowed to hold slaves—Bishop Andrew having become a slave-holder by marriage—the first instance in the history of the denomination. The Northern members contended that the episcopal chair must be kept free from this evil, as it always had been, and that he must, therefore, resign his position. His friends pleaded, protested, and threatened division if he was not let alone. But the Conference, by a vote of 110 to 68, declared that he must desist from the exercise of his office. The result was the secession of a large number of Southern ministers and members, and the formation of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

The new body was at once fully committed to the institution of slavery, theoretically and practically. But the antislavery sentiment had triumphed in the General Conference. The restriction put upon colored testimony in 1840 was also repealed. In 1848 the General Conference rescinded the resolution on the Westmoreland petition.

Sixteen more years of contest remained before the unequivocal rule against all slave-holding could be enacted by the necessary three-fourths vote of the General Conference. In 1860 the chapter on slavery in the Discipline was strengthened so as to embody this exclusive principle, and four years later the specific rule was adopted by a vote of two hundred and seven to nine. The Civil War, occasioned by Republican triumphs, achieved by the prayers and suffrages of antislavery Church members, aided the final solution.

It is hardly necessary to trace the antislavery struggle in the Baptist Church, so similar to those already sketched, which culminated in the division of the denomination in 1845, and the organization of the Northern and Southern Baptist Conventions. Nor have we space to enter into the details of the humiliating compromises of various benevolent boards.

In the course of these agitations another movement took place, one of the most painful to record, because of the bitter and destructive spirit it engendered.

I have no disposition to detract from any credit due to Mr. Garrison as an antislavery agitator. His peculiar talent made him conspicuous, and left a deep impress. But the time came

when the Garrison party diminished in numbers and in influence; and the antislavery cause was carried forward, not merely without his aid, but even in spite of his hinderance. He possessed an extraordinary power of vituperation, and his philippics were terrible irritants. "He prejudiced the minds of good men against the antislavery cause, while the political movement, which ultimately proved the successful one, ever, after 1838, met with his opposition." *

In less than five years from the organization of the first society under Mr. Garrison, the American Antislavery Society numbered 1,350 auxiliaries, existing in every free State, except Indiana and New Jersey, and its annual receipts reached $45,000. But, notwithstanding this rapid progress, he became impatient, and his intensely radical spirit, panting for still more radical reforms, repelled his best tried friends. He forgot that he drew his first antislavery breath from the Church; that his best supporters were the people of the Churches; that of the persons participating in the organization of the American Antislavery Society and its auxiliaries, and those attending the antislavery anniversaries and conventions, full one third were ministers, while more than half of the remainder were communicants of the Churches; that three fourths of the antislavery agents and editors were clergymen; that Hon. George Thompson, with whom he had communed so closely, was a Wesleyan local preacher; that his ablest adherents and *confrères* were Rev. A. A. Phelps, Rev. Joshua Leavitt, Rev. William Goodell, Rev. Nathaniel Colver, Rev. Baron Stowe, Rev. Orange Scott, Rev. Jotham Horton, Rev. Samuel J. May, etc.; and that, instead of a decline, there was a steady growth of reform sentiment and activity in the Churches; all these things and many more he forgot; he abhorred and denounced the Church and State, and sought their overthrow.

In a Fourth-of-July address, at Providence, in 1837, he frenziedly declared, "I stand forth in the spirit of prophecy, to proclaim, in the ears of the people, that our doom as a nation is sealed;" adding, "If history be not wholly fabulous, if revelation be not a forgery, if God be not faithless in the execution of his threatenings, the doom is certain and the execution thereof sure. The overthrow of the American Con-

* Editor of the "Congregational Quarterly," Oct., 1876, p. 552.

federacy is in the womb of events. . . . The corruptions of the *Church*, so-called, are obviously more deep and incurable than those of the *State*, and therefore the *Church*, in spite of every precaution and safeguard, is first to be dashed in pieces." *

Mr. Garrison and his intimate friends were soon intent on other reforms. "Anti-church," "Anti-ministry," "Anti-sabbath," "No Government," "Woman's Rights," etc., were the watch-words. Standing alone on their individual merits, these reforms could get no hearing before the public; therefore it was attempted to "sift them in" upon the antislavery reform.†

The ultraists pleaded ‡ that both the ecclesiastical and the political organizations failed to grasp the question of slavery as its importance demanded; that the slave power was aggressive, arrogant, mandatory, and grasping; that Church after Church had looked on with little interest, often using their influence rather to quiet abolitionists than to harm slavery; that politicians were afraid to attack the monster in the halls of Congress, and quailing statesmen cowered before the bowie-knife and revolver. Under such circumstances, these champions of reform became impatient, bitter, vindictive, and desperate. Out of this feeling the "Comeouter" movement arose, dividing the opposers of slavery into two parties.

The "Comeouter" party, led by the "Liberator," edited by Mr. Garrison, opposed the American Church, not merely the pro-slavery part, but the Church itself, as the bulwark of American slavery, and consequently an institution that could not be reformed, and, therefore, to be abolished before slavery could be reached. The ministry, as dumb dogs (D.Ds.) that would not bark, were placed in the same category, and must go with the Church. The Sabbath was denounced: all days were to be regarded alike. The Bible received a liberal share of abuse, "the non-resistants" discarding its authority as a standard of appeal. It was a stench in their nostrils, because slave-holders and their apologists perverted it to sustain slavery. Reason and conscience were above the Bible. The

* "The True History of the Late Division in the Antislavery Societies," p. 8, 1841.

† Ibid., p. 15.

‡ For some of the facts connected with the origin of the "Comeouter" movement the author is indebted to a letter in the Boston "Daily Advertiser," June 9, 1873, by J. W. Alden.

Old Testament was rejected, as of no authority whatever, and the New, also, when it confronted their theories. These topics were forced upon the antislavery meetings for discussion and indorsement, and special meetings were called, and their doings published in the "Liberator," as antislavery literature.

Another obstacle in the way of emancipation was the Constitution of the United States. Human governments, they affirmed in general, were "of the devil," and the United States Constitution, in particular, was a "covenant with death, a league with hell." It was a sin to vote under it, even to free the slave, because their tender consciences could not approve the act of voting. Slave-holding politicians for fifty years had construed the Constitution in favor of slavery, and pro-slavery divines had done the same thing with the Bible. Inasmuch as the Church, the ministry, the Sabbath, the Bible, and the United States Constitution all lay in the way of the abolition of slavery, they must be removed before slavery could be reached. "The antislavery movement, at the start, favored the use of the elective franchise in behalf of the slave;" but in 1838 the Massachusetts Antislavery Society, under the lead of Mr. Garrison, "was made to abandon its own original doctrines on the subject of political action, and became subservient to the promotion of the dogma of non-governmentism."

These views caused a division and a new organization of antislavery workers. From that time Mr. Garrison's influence declined, and the sphere of his operations was narrowed to a small, dwindling circle* of sour, wrangling spirits, while the great movement, to which his earlier labors contributed an impulse, rolled on in widening circles, under other and wiser leaders.

* Mr. J. W. Alden says: "From the time of the division, in 1839, the 'Liberator' party bent its energies to the abolition of certain institutions we have already named, but American Chattel Slavery was *not* on that catalogue. That must wait and the slave must toil on in bondage until all the others were destroyed. God's institutions were not thus to be destroyed, and the 'Liberator' dug its own grave, in its insane attempt to thwart the divine purposes of the Creator. The Constitution of the United States, which was said to be 'a covenant of death, and a league with hell,' was not *abolished*, but *amended*, so as to wipe out the *construction* put upon it by the slave power and the non-government party, of which the 'Liberator' was the organ as long as it lived. . . . Indeed, Mr. Garrison rendered more service to the slave power by his opposition to the voting abolitionists, during the *two last* decades of the struggle, than he damaged slavery by his advocacy of emancipation in the *first* decade."

The division occurred in the Massachusetts Antislavery Society in May, 1839, and in the American Antislavery Society the year following. By packing the business meeting of the latter society, in 1839, with Massachusetts delegates in sympathy with Mr. Garrison's peculiar views, equal in number to nearly one third of all the votes cast, the Woman's Rights and Non-government party triumphed. In 1840 this victory was made sure by transporting, by special steamboat arrangements, several hundred women from Boston and vicinity to New York to vote in the meeting. The party opposed to the peculiar dogmas of Garrison withdrew, and organized the American and Foreign Antislavery Society* in May, 1840. In Massachusetts, where the split occurred the previous year, the new party was organized as the "Massachusetts Abolition Society," under the leadership of Rev. Amos A. Phelps. The party was chiefly composed of evangelical antislavery Christians of all denominations, who believed in using the ballot-box for the purpose of freeing the slaves. Its paper, "The Abolitionist," was edited at first by Rev. Mr. Phelps, then by Elizur Wright, Jun. Subsequently its name was changed to the "Free American," and was edited by Rev. Charles T. Torrey. Agents were sent out and auxiliaries were formed. Antislavery churches opened their pulpits to the agents, and those who would not commit themselves to antislavery action were glad to part with antislavery members, who formed Churches on the basis of non-fellowship with slave-holders. But no evangelical Church, however antislavery, received the approbation of the other party. While this work was going on "the scattering system" at the polls was abandoned, and the "liberty party" was organized in 1840.

* The following were some of the prominent persons in the new organizations opposed to Mr. Garrison: the Tappans, James G. Birney, Gerrit Smith, H. M. Stanton, T. D. Weld, Rev. A. A. Phelps, Rev. J. Leavitt, Rev. C. T. Torrey, Rev. A. St. Clair, Rev. O. Scott, Rev. D. Wise, Rev. J. Horton, Rev. J. Porter, J. G. Whittier, William Jackson, Judge Jay, William Goodell,[4] Thomas Morris, Edward Beuham, Elizur Wright, Jun., Rev. David Thurston, James Z. Gibbons, Rev. David Root, Alvah Stewart, Esq., Rev. C. P. Grosvenor, etc. Mr. Goodell says: "While these divisions produced a strong sensation in New England and in the sea-board cities, the sound of them going across the Atlantic awakened kindred responses among the abolitionists of Great Britain. The blast died away, like a Massachusetts northeaster, as it traveled westward, spending its strength before it had reached the valley of the Mohawk, and was scarcely felt beyond the waters of Lake Erie."

About this time "The Emancipator," which had been started in New York city, was removed to Boston, and united with the "Free American," with Rev. Joshua Leavitt, D.D., and J. W. Alden, as editors and proprietors, while Rev. George B. Cheever, D.D., and Rev. William Goodell, published the "Principia" in New York.

Those Christian men who did not unite with the antislavery societies were doubtless conscientious, of high character and intelligence, and not wanting in true sympathy for the slave. Some could not approve the impracticable measures of the reformers. Others, from taste or principle, disliked such associations, and felt that they could not be held responsible before the public for either the policy or the opinions advocated by the radical agitators. Deeply abhorring slavery, and desiring to do something for its removal, nevertheless Mr. Garrison's doctrine of immediate emancipation seemed impracticable and impossible. They also shrank from contact with violent and denunciatory persons, who scornfully repelled prudential suggestions or more moderate measures.

On the other hand, other Christian men enjoyed the reform associations, even the stormiest scenes, organizing, leading, and sustaining the meetings vigorously, imparting to the cause its most reliable and influential support, tempering it with their presence, inspiring hope and confidence in the darkest moments, and securing the divine blessing by their prayers.

From the beginning to the close of the movement the Churches were largely represented * by the ministry and the

* It is difficult to do justice to the numerous toilers in this work of reform. But at the risk of overlooking many whose names deserve mention, the following may be specified in addition to others already given: Messrs. Isaac T. Hooper, Robert Vaux, Evan Lewis, and John G. Whittier, Friends; Messrs. Lewis Tappan, Elizur Wright, Jun., Robert Purvis, Dea. Ebenezer Dole, J. W. Alden, James G. Birney, Ephraim Lyman, Gerrit Smith, Wendell Phillips, etc., communicants of evangelical Churches; Revs. C. W. Dennison, George B. Cheever, D.D., S. H. Cox, George Bourne, S. S. Jocelyn, Baron Stowe, Nathaniel Colver, Cyrus P. Grosvenor, S. L. Pomeroy, H. G. Ludlow, O. Wetmore, E. M. P. Wells, Thomas Williams, John Frost, Daniel De Vinne, James Floy, D.D., James Porter, D.D., Phineas Crandall, Daniel Wise, D.D., Luther Lee, D.D., L. C. Matlack, etc., ministers of evangelical Churches; and Professor Follen. Theodore Parker, Rev. W. E. Channing, D.D., and John Pierpont, of the Unitarian Church. Mr. Wendell Phillips did not espouse the cause until the martyrdom of Lovejoy, in 1837. Gerrit Smith, originally an ardent Presbyterian, continued in sympathy with the colonization movement until 1835. He attended the Utica Convention that year, protesting that he

laity, usually constituting a large majority, and often seven-eighths of the working force. Of 146 delegates whose names appear in the annual report of the American Antislavery Society for 1838, the year before the division, 50 were ministers, nearly all of them belonging to "evangelical Churches." It was so every year from 1833 and onward until the division. And yet in the "Liberator," in 1837, Mr. Oliver Johnson said: "The antislavery car has rolled forward thus far not only without the aid, but against the combined influence, of the ministers and Churches of the country." Could any statement more completely ignore the real facts up to that time? Rev. Amos A. Phelps, of the Congregational Church, was regarded by many as "the head and front of antislavery movements in Massachusetts, doing more solid work than almost any other person." * Revs. Joshua Leavitt and William Goodell were little behind him, and some will place Rev. Orange Scott, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, on a parallel with him in effective, self-sacrificing labors. Statistics exist showing that, in 1837, the antislavery societies in Massachusetts numbered 19,206 members, equivalent to one in thirty-six of the whole population of the State, while of the 792 ministers in the State, 367, or almost one half, were enrolled members of these societies. Of the fifty-six agents employed by the American Antislavery Society prior to 1837, forty-three were ministers. † Thus, in this unpopular period of the agi-

was "no abolitionist;" but the mobbing of the convention converted him. He did not break with the Church until 1843. Theodore Parker was uncommitted to the movement until the Mexican war, or about 1846. Hon. Salmon P. Chase espoused the cause in 1841.

* "Watchman and Reflector."

† The "Liberator" (Nov. 3, 1837) said: "A very large proportion of the antislavery agents in the field are of the orthodox faith, aye, and ministers too, or those who are preparing for the ministry—the exceptions, we believe, are rare." "In 1838 Mr. St. Clair, an agent of the State Society, said that the 'orthodox' constituted 'nine tenths of the abolitionists in the State,' and about the same time a leading member of the Boston Committee avowed the intention to keep the control of the antislavery movement in the hands of the church-hating minority, and simply because he disliked the religious views of the majority. This 'majority' was evangelical. At the same time, while but *one in eight* of the Unitarian clergy in this State were members of antislavery societies with the plan of immediate emancipation, or abolition, more than *one in three* of the 'orthodox' Congregationalists, and *two in three* of Baptists and Methodists, were members."—*Watchman and Reflector.*

tation, while the ministers were one in five hundred of the whole population, they were one in five of the front ranks of this reform. And yet Theodore Parker, who espoused this cause nearly ten years later than the date under consideration, was wont to exclaim, "When did the Christianity of the Church ever denounce a popular sin?"

And whence came the antislavery martyrs but from these Churches? Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy, (1837,) Charles T. Torrey, (1846,) John Brown, (1859,) and Rev. Anthony Bewley, (1860,) who laid down their lives in devotion to antislavery principles, were of evangelical Churches. The imprisonment and inhuman branding (S. S., *slave stealer*) of Captain Jonathan Walker, of Massachusetts, at Pensacola, in 1840; the mobbing of Dr. Bailey, editor of the "National Era," Washington, D. C., in 1848; and of Dr. John S. Prettyman, editor of a Republican paper in Delaware, in 1859; and the murderous assault upon Hon. Charles Sumner, the incorruptible senator, we honorably notice and give due rank; but Thomas Garrett, (1848,) who suffered in Delaware; Rev. John G. Fee and Miss Delia Webster, in Kentucky; Revs. Daniel Worth and Silas M'Kenney, in Texas; Rev. Dr. Nelson and Messrs. Thompson and Burr, (students for the ministry,) and Work, in Missouri; and Rev. "Parson" Brownlow, in Tennessee, well-known victims of slave-holding vengeance, were ministers or communicants of evangelical Churches, no less devoted to the cause of the slave.

A writer of a political tract, over the signature of Junius, (supposed to be Calvin Colton, whom no one will charge as too "evangelical,") said: "Nearly all the practical abolitionists, and, with scarcely an exception, all the abolition preachers, lecturers, and missionaries, are religious men. Religion everywhere is the high and holy sanction relied upon to enforce the doctrine."

Mr. Oliver Johnson, whose severe arraignment of the Churches in the "Liberator," in 1837, has been quoted, at a more recent date, in the "Christian Union" of May 7, 1874, under the mellowing influence of later years, said: "The antislavery movement originated in the deepest religious convictions, and derived its main impulse from the spirit of Christianity in the hearts of its champions. It is important to affirm this, because efforts have been made in certain quarters

to justify or excuse the hostility to the movement of the great body of ministers and Churches in the country on the ground of its alleged 'infidel' character and tendency. On this point history must not be perverted nor the truth concealed."

Rev. James Freeman Clarke* said, "If the Churches, as organizations, stood aloof, being only 'timidly good,' as organizations are apt to be, the purest of their body were sure to be found in this great company of 'latter-day saints.'" Again,† "Nevertheless, from the Christian body came most of those who devoted their lives to the extirpation of this great evil. And Mr. Garrison always maintained that his converts were most likely to be made among those whose consciences had been educated by the Church and the Bible."

Hon. George Thompson, in his celebrated debate with Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckenridge, of Kentucky, on slavery, in Glasgow, 1836, said of the American antislavery reformers: "They are universally men and women of religious principles, and, in most instances, of unquestioned piety. He had never known any benevolent enterprise carried forward more in dependence upon divine direction and divine aid than the abolition cause in the United States."

The Garrison party, withdrawing from all political relations, and diverted in purpose by complex social and skeptical hobbies, became a small contracted sphere that could not grow, notwithstanding the most assiduous efforts to bring to their platform every thing that could draw and impress an audience. Many attended their anniversaries to witness the gladiatorial sport, for they were fierce tournaments. But the movement did not expand. It lacked moral cohesion, was repellant and chilling rather than attractive and vitalizing.

"Their orators were of every kind, rough men and shrill-voiced women, polished speakers from the universities, stammering fugitives from slavery, philosophers and fanatics, atheists and Christian ministers, wise men who had been made mad by oppression, and babes in intellect, to whom God had revealed some of the noblest truths. They murdered the king's English; they uttered glaring fallacies; the blows aimed at evil often glanced aside and hit good men. Invective was, perhaps, the too-frequent staple of their argument;

* "North American Review," Jan., 1875, p. 81. † Ibid., p. 55.

and any difference of opinion would be apt to turn their weapons against each other. The Church militant often became a Church termagant." *

But the newly organized party, retaining the doctrine of political action against slavery, formerly advocated by Garrison, gradually grew. Hundreds of ministers and thousands of the laity left pro-slavery Churches and organized Churches on a strict antislavery basis. Ministerial antislavery conventions were held, and Christian antislavery conventions, large influential bodies, and wholly by the anti-Garrison party. Simultaneously with them, and mutually contributing to each other, started the Liberty party, (1840,) the Free Soil party, (1848,) and the Republican party, (1854,) each the successor of the other, and all the outgrowth of the action, in and out of the Churches, of the antislavery party opposed to Mr. Garrison's peculiar hobbies. Messrs. Smith, Birney, Stewart, Green, Chaplin, Torrey, and Goodell, nearly all of whom were active in these Christian antislavery conventions, were the organizers of the Liberty party; and Mr. Goodell was for several years editor of the paper supported by this party in New York. So also the organ of the Massachusetts Abolition Society became the organ of the Liberty party in Massachusetts.

Rev. D. D. Whedon, LL.D., who has been a close observer and active participator by pen and voice in this great movement, from about 1832 onward, in his Introduction † to Dr. Matlack's forthcoming "History of Methodism and Slavery," appreciatively says: "When Garrisonianism rang out its 'fire-bell in the night,' there were millions unprepared for its peal and doubting the certainty of its sounds. The movement was started by men who had little at stake in the existing order of society, and the alarm was felt by the great body of those who had much to lose in a coming convulsion. The great aggregate of the weighty, wise, and good, stood in the opposition. They believed that slavery was a moral and political evil; but they also believed that somehow it was temporary, and that rash measures would both perpetuate the evil and produce other evils of incalculable magnitude. But as the battle

* Rev. James Freeman Clarke, D.D., in "North American Review," January, 1875, p. 54.

† The writer was kindly favored with advance sheets of the Introduction.

waxed warm, and the slave-power, in self-defense, became bold and announced a claim to perpetuity and even supremacy, thousands after thousands felt compelled to join the antislavery ranks, and to demand, first, the limitation of slavery, and finally to claim its immediate extirpation.

"But the abolition of slavery was not a moral achievement, but a war measure. Had the slave power stood solid, yet calm, maintaining its silent position, and making no aggressions, slavery would, to all appearance, be standing at this hour, perhaps the stronger for the opposition."

No one can question this position, and it deserves more serious consideration by those who ascribe the emancipation of the slaves in the United States to Mr. Garrison.

A few collateral facts should be added to complete the story. The culminating events of the antislavery movement and the emancipation of the slaves, in the nature of the case political measures, effected by civil agencies, in which our greatest and best statesmen acted honorable and conspicuous parts, was not accomplished without the permeating and extensively controlling influence of the Protestant Churches, as represented by their membership in the Republican party. The preponderating numbers of this great party defeated slavery extension in the Territories, elected a Republican President, provoked the South to rebellion, and thus created the exigency in which emancipation was proclaimed. It is believed that the Protestant denominations, through their communicants and adherents, furnished the chief part of the moral strength of the Republican party. The ecclesiastical conferences, associations, and conventions throughout the North, from 1850 to the close of the Civil War, passed numerous resolutions bearing upon national issues, such as the compromise measures of 1850, the Fugitive Slave Bill, the Dred Scott Decision, the Kansas and Nebraska schemes, etc., sustaining, by overwhelming majorities, the politico-moral issues which entered into the movements of the Republican party; and, in most of the Northern States, three fourths of the communicants and adherents of these Churches, and in some localities, nine tenths of them, acted with that party, constituting its most influential and reliable supporters. Sermons, addresses, and prayers innumerable, by the Protestant clergy,

echoed the deep religious convictions of the Christian public. Piles of sermons* against the Fugitive Slave Bill, the Kansas atrocities, and other cognate topics, delivered between 1845 and 1865, have been collected in the public libraries for future reference. The Republican party was emphatically the party of the highest moral and religious sentiment.

The Congressional records show numerous petitions and remonstrances of individual Churches, of ministers and ecclesiastical bodies, bearing upon these great questions. The religious press entered into the contest, conspicuous among which was the "Independent," edited by Revs. Leonard Bacon, D.D., J. P. Thompson, D.D., R. S. Storrs, D.D., and Henry Ward Beecher. "Uncle Tom's Cabin," and kindred works, imbued with fervid religious sentiment, moved the masses. The very boldness of the projects of the slave power awakened revulsion and intensified antislavery action. Memorials, numerously signed by clergymen from the Middle and Western States, poured into Congress, and one hundred and twenty-five separate remonstrances within a few months came from the ministers of the six New England States. There came a mammoth memorial, two hundred feet long, bearing the names of three thousand and fifty New England clergymen,† so ingeniously engrossed as to preserve the original signature and heading of each petition, protesting "in the name of Almighty God," against the proposed extension of the domain of slavery in the territory of the United States. On its presentation to the Senate, Hon. Edward Everett apologetically alluded to it as "a somewhat voluminous document." Hon. Stephen A. Douglas characterized it as "informal and monstrous," and Hons. John M. Mason, of Virginia, and Mr. Butler, of South Carolina, poured out their indignation against the political parsons, and prognosticated evil omens from such participation in political action by the Christian clergy. Hon. Samuel Houston, with characteristic magnanimity, declared that he saw

* The beautiful volume of "National Sermons," by Rev. Bishop Gilbert Haven, covering a period of about fifteen years, is a fine specimen of these discourses, and of great historic value.

† This idea originated with Mrs. H. B. Stowe, who suggested it to Rev. Henry M. Dexter, D.D., editor of the "Congregationalist," through whose agency the heading was prepared at a meeting of Boston ministers, and the names were obtained. None except the Roman Catholic clergy refused to sign it.

in the paper nothing informal nor monstrous, and that "this memorial, signed by three thousand and fifty ministers of the living God, is evidence that the people are deeply moved." And Hon. Charles Sumner, then fresh in his seat in the Senate, thanked the ministers for their interposition, adding: "In the days of the Revolution, John Adams, yearning for independence, said, 'Let the pulpits thunder against oppression,' and the pulpits thundered. The time has come for them to thunder again."

I have thus endeavored, in a faithful manner, and with as much detail as my limits will allow, to sketch the relations of the religious bodies to the antislavery reform. The legislation of the Churches was sometimes unfortunate and even reprehensible. Majorities opposed and retaliated against the agitators. Men of undoubted piety cast their influence against the abolition movement, because of the legal difficulties in the way of emancipation. They felt compelled to conservative action. This produced friction; and bitterness, complaint, and denunciation followed. Thus the attitude of the Churches, out of whose bosom the reform sprung, was seriously crippled.

In so radical and extensive a movement, where the evil to be removed was a system venerable for age, intimately interwoven with great civil, social, and financial interests, and intrenched behind constitutional provisions, the progress was necessarily slow and difficult, occasioning impatience and censoriousness. Numerous ecclesiastical schisms — results not easily reached in bodies cemented by powerful, social, and religious bonds—and clearly showing how powerfully the antislavery sentiment became arrayed against the accursed system of slavery, were effected in the largest denominations in the land. Radical measures, intense appeals, and uncompromising speech abounded in the contest. They were necessities. Strife and opposition were inevitable, calling for redoubtable moral heroes. Whatever of human frailty appeared can be forgiven, but the sad effects which followed the unfortunate embarrassments of the Churches cannot be forgotten, nor the fact that, nevertheless, the germ, the impulse, and the best strength of the movement sprung out of the Churches.

Art. VI.—THE WESLEY MEMORIAL VOLUME.

The Wesley Memorial Volume; or, Wesley and the Methodist Movement, Judged by nearly One Hundred and Fifty Writers, Living or Dead. Edited by Rev. J. O. A. Clark, D.D., LL.D. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. J. W. Burke & Co., Macon, Ga. J. B. M'Ferrin, Agt., Nashville, Tenn. L. D. Dameron & Co., St. Louis, Mo. 1880.

To writers outside its own communion Methodism has furnished themes and materials for books, reviews, and essays without number. Churchman, dissenter, and skeptic alike have found it a most inviting and fruitful field for inquiry, criticism, and speculation. It is safe to affirm that no religious movement since the days of the apostles has, in the same length of time, been more generally and thoroughly discussed. From every conceivable stand-point, and in every diversity of spirit, its character, methods, and results have been subjected to critical analysis and comment.

Many writers of the class referred to have manifested a Christian friendliness toward Methodism; but not all. It is not the fruitfulness of the field alone that has enlisted the interest and engaged the research of some. But the movement has assumed such proportions, such are its achievements, and it is entering as such a potential factor into contemporary history, that they cannot ignore or lightly dismiss it. Fidelity to truth, and the sense of common justice in mankind, imperatively require that it be taken due account of by the secular as well as the religious historian, by the philosopher as well as the theologian. And any one who undertakes to give a general survey of the great moral forces now at work in the world must give prominence to Methodism, or else incur the opprobrium of bigotry and prejudiced partiality.

While Methodism is thus winning its way to a place in the general literature of the age, it is also creating a literature of its own of by no means insignificant merit. It was born in the midst of literary surroundings, of the heart and brain of literary men quickened into reproductive energy by the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Its literature was the support of its infancy, the stronghold in which it abode in safety. It has kept pace with its growth, and to-day covers the entire field of its multiform activities.

In his philosophic analysis of Methodism, Isaac Taylor defines its first element as "the waking up of a consciousness toward Almighty God, which gave a meaning" to the terminology of the Church, and transformed its dead formularies into living verities of the most solemn significance. The feeling awakened was different not only in degree, but in kind, from any thing the soul had experienced before; it was "as if a lost rudiment of the moral nature had sprung into activity." In such an awakening of the religious consciousness all the powers of the soul are stirred by new impulses, and the entire man is lifted into a new and higher life. From this higher plane there are new views of truth and duty, of privilege and destiny, and, as a result, quickened thought and intensified moral sensibility. The immediate fruit, in a well-ordered moral constitution, is religious enthusiasm; and thus Methodism becomes, philosophically, "Christianity in earnest." Nothing less is to be expected than that its earnestness should embody and manifest itself in all the varied forms of Christian enterprise, and that it should avail itself of every admissible agency within its reach in the prosecution of its mission. A Methodism without its presses and books, reviews, monthlies, weeklies, tracts, —a literature adapted to the condition and wants of all classes —is not the Methodism portrayed by Isaac Taylor, or described in the aphorism of Chalmers. Methodism is a life, an active, energetic, joyous life in Christ, and as such will have its literature along with other modes of manifestation, just as naturally as the tree puts on its foliage and brings forth its fruit.

Lord Bacon said, concerning books, that "Some are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested." It is not unlikely that in the great mass of Methodist literature there are many books that properly belong to the first and second of these classes. There may be no poison in them, but there is no aliment, neither milk for babes nor strong meat for men. A taste is all that they deserve, and is all-sufficient for the earnest seeker after soul food. Or if there be nutriment in any of them, it is in a solution so dead that there is not a sparkle on its surface, and so weak that the babe may swallow it. But, on the other hand, there are "some few" at least that have real, permanent worth. They are full of pure, vigorous, healthful thought, and are "profitable for doctrine,

for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness." They awaken thought, panoply the soul with truth, enlarge its conceptions of divine things, awaken in it new and grander aspirations, and furnish "the man of God unto all good works."

The book whose title appears in the caption of this article belongs to the last-mentioned class. It is food for mind and heart, both substantial and savory. To taste it merely will not satisfy, but only whet, the mental appetite; to swallow it entire would be a feat scarcely possible to the most voracious literary gormand; nothing less than the process of deliberate chewing and digestion at leisure will develop its admirable qualities and secure the full benefit of its nutritive forces. It is a book that may be *read* as a delightful and profitable entertainment for the passing hour, but one that must be *studied* in order to a just appreciation of its intrinsic excellence and real significance.

Methodism is indebted for this valuable contribution to its literature to the scheme inaugurated in 1875 of building the Wesley Monumental Church in Savannah, Georgia, "the only city in America in which Mr. Wesley had a home and a parish." This movement received the official indorsement of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at its General Conference in 1878, and the Rev. J. O. A. Clark, D.D., LL.D., was accredited as its agent. The connectional and ecumenical idea was fundamental with the originators of the enterprise. It was this specific feature more than any other that won for it the official approval of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. It is of this idea that Dr. Clark is the representative. He "was appointed, commissioned, and sent to the various Methodisms of the world to solicit the co-operation of them all." While in England, in prosecution of his mission, he conceived the idea that such a volume as that now given to the public would aid in "building the 'Monumental Church,' help to illustrate the life work of John Wesley, and bring the various Methodisms of the world into closer union and fellowship." And if the movement were to accomplish nothing more than the production of this volume, it would be an achievement well worth all that it has cost.

The plan of the work is unique. It is composed of between

forty and fifty essays, each essay complete in itself and independent of the rest. The subjects of these articles were chosen by the editor, as were also the writers, who, for the most part, are representative men in the various branches of the Methodist family on both sides of the Atlantic. Among the contributors from other communions are such men as Dean Stanley, Dr. Dobbin, and Mr. Overton, of the Church of England; Sir Charles Reed, of the Independents of England; and Dr. De Pressensé, of the Reformed Church of Paris. Of course John Wesley and the Methodist movement is the general topic of the work. And, as might be anticipated, he is presented in every phase of his many-sided character and in every stage of his religious life; while the movement which he inaugurated is exhibited from the stand-points of history, theology, and philosophy, in its own character, in its relations to other organizations, and in its influence on the Church and the world in his own and subsequent times.

In such a work there must of necessity be great diversity of style, as well as inequality of merit in its articles. The former is not displeasing, and the latter, so far from operating a discount on the work, will rather enhance its value in the judgment of the intelligent reader. The writers are representative men. It is fair to presume that in the preparation of their articles they have done some of their best work, work which may safely be accepted as exponential of the mind and culture of the various branches of Methodism to which they belong. If so, then the reader may find here, and nowhere else in the same compass, data for an at least approximately correct conclusion as to the intellectual status of the different Methodisms relatively, and of Methodism as a whole. The student of leisure will go to original sources for information on this interesting topic; to the history, educational statistics, and literary products of these several communions; but, after all his research, his conclusion will not differ very materially from that of the judicious and discriminating reader of this memorial volume. It does not come within the purview of this article to enter the field of inquiry here opened, and deduce the inferences that might be suggested. It is enough to say that the exhibit of Methodist culture and literary excellence and ability is most gratifying, and will challenge

comparison with any similar production either within or without the Church of Christ. While all these essays are highly creditable to their authors and to the communions they represent, some of them are unsurpassed for purity, strength, classic beauty and elegance by any thing in the English language.

It will not be considered invidious if special mention be made of Rev. L. H. Holsey, Bishop of the Colored M. E. Church in America, and Rev. B. F. Lee, L.B., of the African M. E. Church, as contributors to this work. While the ecumenical spirit and plan of the editor required that the colored Methodisms should be represented, such representation is in perfect accord with the Christian sentiment and conviction of the age. Ecclesiastical ostracism, because of race or color, is in contravention of the fundamental principles of the Gospel. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." The Church of Christ is an essential unity, and no member, or class of members, can lightly esteem any other member without dishonoring the Head. Dr. Clark, a Southern man by birth, education, and affinities, along with true Christian men every-where, stands squarely on this platform. That in the section to which he belongs there lingers much of the ancient feudal spirit, no one will deny. Nor will any reasonable man expect that spirit—the growth of centuries—suddenly to become extinct. But, on the other hand, men of honest, intelligent patriotism, to say nothing of religion, must and will rejoice in the intellectual and moral elevation of all classes of our population; and nowhere will *such* men rejoice more in the improved condition of the negro than in the South, the interests of which are now so largely dependent on his intelligent appreciation of the rights and duties of citizenship. In any tokens of his progress and enlarged capabilities all good men find occasion of profound satisfaction. And when Dr. Clark places Bishop Holsey and Rev. B. F. Lee in this galaxy of Methodism—the latter side by side with himself—he only gives tangible expression to a conviction of right which is deeply imbedded in the faith of the Christian men of the South, who, in common with such men elsewhere, rejoice that these representatives of the African race fill their places with such a high degree of credit.

A complete unity was an ideal scarcely realizable in the first and only work of this character that has ever been attempted. The indifference of some, the remembrance of by-gone feuds, and the remains of ancient prejudices in others, essential differences in ecclesiastical polity, strong Church predilections in all, and many minor difficulties, were in the way of the realization of such an ideal. On the contrary, there was a powerful influence favorable to it in the prevailing tendency toward unification in all religious bodies, especially those of the same creed. The Evangelical Alliance, the Pan-Presbyterian Council, the approaching Ecumenical Conference of Methodism, International Sunday-school Conventions and Christian Associations, are the fruit of this tendency, and at the same time the means of this growth. Aided by this spirit of the times, Dr. Clark has so far overcome existing difficulties as in an eminent degree to attain a grand unity. He has brought together representatives of well-nigh every branch of Methodism, and with them a goodly number from other communions, on a common platform; they meet in one common center and strike hands in Christian fellowship. There is an entire absence of the spirit of party—no unnecessary reference to denominational peculiarities—no assumption on the part of any of a superior claim as an exponent of Wesleyan doctrine and polity, and, if we except the paper of Bishop G. F. Pierce, of the M. E. Church, South, nothing from first to last that savors of controversy. While there is this beautiful harmony within, there is manifested no illiberality toward any that are without. There is no disparagement of any evangelical Church, and no resentful harshness toward the bitterest opponents of Mr. Wesley and the Methodist movement. In this oneness of spirit among these writers, in their exhibition of the traditional liberality of Methodism, and in the oneness of their completed work, is one of the most pleasing features of the "Memorial Volume."

As the venerable Bishop Simpson, in his brief Preface to the work, says: "Mr. Wesley was many-sided, and from many points of view his characteristics are worthy of record." No man has appeared in the history of the Church since the days of the apostles in whose character were so many, and such a diversity, of qualities in pre-eminent manifestation. Viewed from opposite stand-points and through different *media*, there

may have been apparent contrasts and contradictions. Indeed, it would be little less than marvelous if, through a life so long, of such vast and varied labors, and of such changeful circumstances, he had always appeared the same to every observer. Different characteristics would most naturally come into greater prominence under different conditions. From these special manifestations the unphilosophic would form their estimate of the whole character. Hence the great variety of opinions that men have entertained concerning him. Hence, too, the impossibility of forming a just and adequate idea of any of the great men of history from the records of any one chronicler. There are fourteen histories of Mr. Wesley extant. Each one of them is, no doubt, in many respects just; but no one of them is adequate; and for the simple reason that every man's work takes its coloring from that characteristic which from his point of view and from his peculiar mental structure impresses him the most strongly. It is scarcely to be expected that any one man should take that completeness and comprehensiveness of view necessary to the presentation of such a character in all its grand integrity. Each one of these memorial writers has devoted his powers of research and analysis to some one feature of his character or his work; in the synthesis of the whole, he appears as in no other single volume in any language—not yet, indeed, "in his whole round of rays complete," but as one of the most magnificent figures in the history of the Church militant.

Science has not yet sufficiently established and defined the operation of the laws of heredity to enable us to measure the influence of ancestry on individual character. But that there is some such influence, and that, unobstructed by counter working forces, it will be a potent agency in molding the character and life of men, will not admit of reasonable doubt. Intellectual and moral traits, as well as physical excellences or defects, are often transmitted from parent to child, and in such prominence as to give tone and coloring to the entire history of the individual. In his admirable paper on "The Wesley Family," Mr. Stevenson gives the lineage of the family for nearly a thousand years, and affirms that "in the annals of both England and Ireland the Wesleys have a place which marks them in successive generations as among the foremost men of the age for loyalty, chivalry, learning, piety, poetry, and music."

How much these characteristics of his ancestry may have had to do in giving cast to Mr. Wesley's character cannot be determined; while, with Paul, he could say: "By the grace of God, I am what I am," it is not difficult to believe that that grace had been at work for a thousand years, originating, combining, and directing the forces necessary to the production of such a man at such a period in the world's history. Dr. Lipscombe, in the article on the "Providence of God in Methodism," says: "The cradle, the nursery, the parental home, were made ready for its advent." The providence that, by no merely "happy conjuncture of circumstances" prepared the place, likewise prepared the man. Methodism is often called "the child of providence," in the superficial sense of its adaptability to circumstances; it is so in the deeper, truer sense of being one of the developments of God's gracious administration, the preparation for which had been going forward through a series of ages. This view gives a profound significance to the fact that Mr. Wesley was born of such a long line of honorable ancestry. It reveals the hand of God, shaping events and directing the secret powers of nature to the working out of his great purposes in his appointed time.

In his beautiful portraiture of "John Wesley and his Mother," Dr. Potts says: "If God ever prepared a handmaid of his to be the mother of one specially commissioned and qualified to revive his Church, God surely raised up Susanna Wesley to be the mother and spiritual guide of the great reformer of the Churches in the eighteenth century." While much may perhaps be ascribed to the providence of God in his remoter ancestry, more, far more, is due to that providence which gave him such a mother. As God's instrument, she watched over his infancy, gave direction to the impulses and aims of his young life, chose for him and aided him in his studies, blessed him with her sympathies, prayers, and judicious counsels, and, more than all other human agencies combined, "helped to fit him for his wonderful destiny. She not only influenced her honored son as to his own character, but also stamped the impress of her discipline and doctrinal views upon the Methodist system."

In addition to inherited qualities, parental wisdom and piety, and educational advantages, there was a formative, disciplinary

influence at work of a different character. This was the type of religion then predominant in the Church of England—not the shameful irreligion of that Church, but that wherein consisted its religion. That it consisted for the most part in the observance of forms and rites cannot be denied. It was a baptized Pharisaism, as Archbishop Leighton testifies, "a fair carcass without the spirit." While such a religion cannot save, it is easy to see how it may contribute to the greater efficiency of God's chosen instruments. Mr. Wesley was to be the apostle, not of a new theology, but of a new life. Dr. Dobbin, of the Church of England, in his eloquent contribution on "The Ideas Wesley Developed," gives especial prominence to these three: "The absolute necessity of personal and individual religion; the absolute need of spiritual influence to secure the conversion of the soul; and that the Church of Jesus Christ is a spiritual organization, consisting of spiritual men associated for spiritual purposes." In order to the most effective enforcement of these great truths an experience of the insufficiency of formalism is an important prerequisite. Paul was a more powerful preacher of the righteousness of faith for having been "after the straitest sect a Pharisee." And Wesley was only the more thoroughly prepared for his spiritual mission by his realization of the worthlessness of mere legalism, however comprehensive its exactions or absolute his compliance with them. The scholarly editor of the "Memorial Volume" describes Wesley in Savannah. It was there that his legalism culminated. There he voluntarily endured the greatest hardships. But, as Dr. Clark truly says, "The trials, persecutions, vigils, fastings, and perils in the solitudes of the wilderness, were necessary to form and develop the future revivalist and reformer for the great work to which God had called him." By the fearful bondage of the letter he is prepared to witness with the greater power for the freedom of the Spirit.

It was while in Savannah, the scene probably of his deepest soul-struggles, that, in Mr. Wesley's religious experience, it began to dawn toward a glorious spiritual day. "It was there," says Dr. Clark, "his high-churchmanship received its deadly wound. He left Savannah a very different, a wiser, and a better man," and a *converted* man, Dr. Clark believes, and argues forcibly to prove. But, if he was a converted

man, he did not know it; nor did he at any subsequent time identify any change wrought in him while in America as spiritual regeneration. The preponderance of evidence is in favor of the commonly accepted date and place of his conversion, namely, May 24, 1738, in a Moravian Society meeting in Aldersgate-street, London. He testifies that it was then, "while one was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ," that his "heart was strangely warmed." Whatever may have been his spiritual state hitherto, it was not until then that he received the Spirit of adoption, and "the joy of a free, full, present, and eternal salvation flowed in upon his soul."

A period of nearly ten years intervened between his ordination by Bishop Potter and his conversion through the instrumentality of Peter Böhler. These were years of prayerful, self-denying, and unshrinking devotion to duty; yet were they years not only of spiritual unrest, but of comparative failure in his ministry. But with the *strange warming* of his heart he entered into the sweet rest of faith, and a success, no doubt beyond any thing of which he had conceived, began at once to crown his labors. Henceforth the Spirit of the Lord God was upon him, and the Gospel as he preached it was "not in word only, but also in power and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance." He stirred the religious sensibilities of the people, and moved and melted the multitudes that flocked to his ministry as had never been done before. Mighty men had arisen in the Church before his day; mighty men were his contemporaries and colaborers; but for intensity of spiritual power, and, that best of all tests of its genuineness, the magnitude and permanency of spiritual results, he exceeded them all.

To those who are disposed to inquire into the secret of his power, the essay on "Wesley the Preacher," by Dr. Rigg, will be deeply interesting. He makes special mention of his clear, vivid, direct, and terse, but copious, style; of the tone and presence of calm, unconscious authority in both his manner and speech, and of the directness of his appeals to the consciences of men, and his impassioned earnestness of entreaty. In the paper of Rev. M. Lelièvre, on "Wesley as the Popular Preacher," will be found a similar analysis. He finds in Wesley's perfect frankness, his incisiveness of utterance, his logical

power, his simplicity, precision, and nervousness of style, and his directness of application and appeal, the constituents of his power. More comprehensive than either of these, and perhaps more satisfactory, is the analysis of Dr. Douglass. In the paper on "Wesley as a Revivalist," he maintains that, 1, his theology, 2, his spiritual life, 3, his style of preaching, and, 4, his power of organization, were "the elements which conspired to render him foremost of all revivalists whom the world had ever witnessed."

With such a combination of qualities, inspired by one impulse and consecrated to one end, it is not surprising that he had power with men. But add to this his divinely authenticated credentials as an ambassador of Christ, the attestation of the truth of his message by the Holy Ghost in his own experience, and the domination of his soul and life by what Mr. Overton calls "his master passion, the love of God and the love of man for God's sake," and it is no matter of astonishment that such signs and wonders attended his preaching, and that such multitudes were turned from the power of Satan unto God.

Excluded as he was from the Churches of the Establishment, he must either dishonor his commission or go out into the highways, entering wherever a door might be opened before him. He had a profound respect for authority, a genuine affection for the Church; but he could not hesitate, he must go, did go, and "mightily grew the word of God and prevailed." By the force of circumstances he became an itinerant. Bishop Pierce has portrayed "Wesley as an Itinerant." In one pregnant sentence he crystallizes the wonderful history: "He saw itinerancy in all its phases, tested all its capabilities, exhausted its trials, and, despite of its weariness, exposures, and privations, left it a legacy to his people." The beginning of his itinerancy, or, as Isaac Taylor has it, "The field-preaching of Wesley and Whitefield is the event whence the religious epoch now current must date its commencement."

His activity in sowing and reaping was equaled only by his diligence in garnering the fruits of his labors. To conserve, concentrate, augment, and guide the forces of the great movement, and accomplish the largest possible results for Christ and humanity, was his single aim. In the prosecution of this

aim, he exhibits a profound practical wisdom, a "genius for government," says Macaulay, "not inferior to that of Richelieu." In the paper on "Wesley the Founder of Methodism," Bishop M'Tyeire, after claiming for him a large share of the gifts of Fletcher, Whitefield, and his brother Charles, dialectician, orator, poet, adds, "He was all these and more. He was the organizer, the spiritual governor." There was little, if any, prearrangement of plans. He met emergencies as they arose, adopting such methods as the indications of providence suggested. He organized the undisciplined multitudes of his followers into Societies under what are known as the General Rules. For the instruction, reproof, exhortation, of both believers and inquirers, he adopted the class-meeting, making attendance on it a condition of membership in the Society. To such men as were willing to devote themselves wholly to evangelistic work he assigned fields of labor, removing or changing them, on a systematized itinerant plan, as the interests of the movement might require. Others, called to preach but not in circumstances to itinerate, he employed as lay preachers, giving them charge of the Societies, and authorizing them to preach in the communities in which they lived. Rev. Isaac P. Cook, writing on "Wesley and Lay Preaching," gives a history of this arm of the service, and presents clearly and strongly its relation to the itinerant ministry and its efficiency as an auxiliary. It was a great irregularity in the eyes of the clergy, but Mr. Wesley regarded it as providential. It began without his knowledge with Thomas Maxfield, a class-leader. At his mother's suggestion, before deciding to arrest the innovation, he went to hear Maxfield. After the sermon he said, "It is of the Lord; let him do what seemeth to him good. Who am I, that I should withstand God!" and forthwith lay preaching became a part of his system. Some of his most powerful fellow-helpers in the Gospel belonged to this class.

It was not originally, if ever, his intention to establish an independent Church; but with the materials that providence had put in his hands, the necessities of the work, and his genius for organization, such a result was scarcely evitable. Dr. Rigg, in his essay on "Wesley and the Church of England," says: "His whole soul revolted from the thought

of his people deliberately, for reasons assigned, and upon a manifesto of dissent and separation, severing themselves from the Church. If there were to be a separation, his determination through life was, that the separation should be imposed and forced upon, not sought or determined by, the Methodists." On the other hand, he adds that it seems to be undeniable "that the utmost divergence of Methodism from the Church of England at this day is but the prolongation of a line the beginning of which was traced by Mr. Wesley's own hand." Bishop Stevens affirms that the fatal point of departure "was the ordination of Coke and Asbury as superintendents of the American Societies in 1784," and that previous to that time "there was nothing in the views, or plans, or usages of the Wesleys which might not, without any wrenching or violence have been brought into harmony with the Anglican system." But there was in the Methodist movement something more than "views, or plans, or usages;" it was instinct with spiritual life from its center to its circumference, and in nothing but a separation could that life find scope for healthful growth and fruitage. Its tendency from the beginning was in that direction. The principle of independency was constitutional in the system; the system must perish or the principle must develop into a fact.

Mr. Wesley was too much of a philosopher, as well as a philanthropist, not to include education in his system of agencies for the elevation and salvation of men. Bishop Haven, writing of "Wesley as an Educator," after making mention of his educational work during his brief stay in Georgia, says it was after his return to England and his conversion that he "began to manifest his strong interest in education, not as some would say, second only to religion, but actually one with and inseparable from it." In 1740 he began his school at Kingswood, which "has expanded and been multiplied into colleges, theological schools, and academic institutions of every grade. To the establishment and encouragement of schools both secular and religious, he added educational, literary, and religious authorship. Reckoning his abridgments and compilations," says Dr. Punshon, "more than two hundred volumes proceeded from his fertile pen. Grammars, exercises, dictionaries, compendiums, sermons and notes, a voluminous Christian

library, a miscellaneous monthly magazine, tracts, addresses, answers, apologies, works polemical, classical, poetic, scientific, political, were poured forth in astonishing succession." And in all this work his single aim was to supply what he conceived to be some present demand. He was not a dreamer, or mere theorist, but eminently utilitarian in his views and plans. It was to the age in which he lived, to its intellectual and moral improvement that, under the impulse of a profound religious conviction, he gave his time and toil. And if any man has labored more earnestly for his generation, history has failed to record his name.

To him belongs the honor of having inaugurated the Sunday-school enterprise. All honor to Robert Raikes for the part he bore in the great work in England. But he was yet an infant when Mr. Wesley organized a Sunday-school in his Church in Savannah. Sir Charles Reed, in his contribution on "Wesley and Sunday-Schools," says that in 1736 "he had commenced the work which Raikes was permitted to accomplish in England more than forty years afterward." But even in England the Sunday-school work was begun by Hannah Ball, a Methodist, twelve years before Raikes engaged in it. "The very idea was suggested to his mind by Sophia Cook, another Methodist." To Mr. Wesley, therefore, as the indirect instrument, belongs the credit of the origin of this movement both in Europe and America. His active interest in it to the close of his life is abundantly manifested in his Journal and correspondence.

And into what field of Christian activity did he not enter? In almost every such field he was a pioneer. In the able paper on "Wesley and Methodism," Dr. Clark says, "The great enterprises of the evangelical Churches which have distinguished the last century and a half received their origin and impetus from his labors and zeal." This is a high claim, but it is substantiated by the facts. The first tract society the world ever had, and the first Bible society, the first Stranger's Friend Society, the first Medical Dispensary, he and his co-workers organized and operated. The great missionary societies of the world are traceable directly to him and his preachers. "The world is my parish," said he, and no uninspired man ever conceived and put in operation agencies so numerous, so compre-

hensive, far-reaching, and magnificent in their results. In the remarkable article, "Wesley and the Methodist Movement, Judged by Nearly One Hundred and Fifty Writers, Living or Dead," Dr. Clark has collected and skillfully arranged a great number of expressions of opinion concerning Wesley, and estimates of his character and work by men of learning in the Church of England, among Dissenters, among his own followers, and from the ranks of skepticism. No one sentence will express the concurrent testimony of all these witnesses more fully than these words of Dr. Dobbin: "A greater poet may arise than Homer or Milton; a greater theologian than Calvin; a greater philosopher than Bacon or Newton; a greater dramatist than any of ancient or modern fame; but a more distinguished revivalist of the Churches, minister of the sanctuary, believer of the truth, and blessing to souls, than John Wesley, *never*. . . . In the firmament in which he was lodged he shone and shines 'the bright particular star,' beyond comparison, as he is without a rival."

It is impossible to form any adequate conception of the influence of such a man, either on his own or subsequent generations. Mr. Overton says, "The world has at length done tardy justice to its benefactor;" but full justice can never be done until his benefactions are fully measured and appreciated. And if Southey is right is considering Mr. Wesley as "the man who will have produced the greatest effects centuries, or perhaps millenniums, hence," then the world will not do him full justice for centuries or millenniums to come.

No one has contributed more than he to the stability, order, and prosperity of the British Empire. Eminently loyal himself, the whole of his wonderful personal influence with the masses of his followers was in favor of subjection and fidelity to the powers that be. More potential than this was the profoundly religious sentiment which he awakened among the people, and the practical piety which he inculcated and illustrated. Even those who maligned and opposed him could not but feel the influence of his life and labors. That the Archbishop of Canterbury could openly pray that the blessing of God might rest upon him; and that the Bishop of London could say to him, "Mr. Wesley, may I be found at your feet in heaven," is evidence that the pulsations of the mighty move-

ment which was going forward among the masses were felt in the high places of both Church and State. While it was working a moral renovation in the governed, and developing their Christian patriotism, it was working a wise moderation in the throne. To Charles Wesley, Jun., King George III. said: "To your uncle (John Wesley) and your father (Charles Wesley) and to George Whitefield and the Countess of Huntingdon, the *Church* in this realm is more indebted than to all others;" and it may be truthfully added that to them more than to his own political wisdom, or the genius of his counselors, or the prowess of his arms, the *State* was indebted for its security and well-being.

That he and his colaborers wrought a revolution in the theological thought and teaching of his age cannot be questioned. It was at their hands that high Calvinism received the blow which drove it from the pulpits of the Establishment. They did more than *check* the prevalent Antinomianism—they lopped off its branches, cut down its trunk, and drew out and destroyed its roots. They sapped the foundations of that self-complacent Pelagianism which rested on the fancied moral ability and dignity of human nature. They demonstrated the worthlessness of a mere traditionalism, and indirectly, as Mr. Abbey says, "gave a death blow to the then existing forms of Deism." They did not preach any new Gospel. The truths they proclaimed were all contained in the formularies of the Church, "but they had become buried and fossilized in learned folios, and throughout Christendom they had but few living witnesses." With nothing but the accepted creed of the Church, they revolutionized the Church itself, and turned the world upside down. That Mr. Wesley was the father of the evangelical party in the Church of England may not be assented to by all. Some, indeed, claim that honor for Whitefield. Whatever its parentage, Mr. Gladstone affirms that it received its main impulse from Methodism. A Churchman, then, being witness, the arrest of the Romish heresy of salvation by the Church and its sacraments was largely if not primarily due to the Wesleyan revival. It gave to the doctrines of justification by faith alone and the witness of the Spirit, and to practical experimental religion, a place in the religious thinking and teaching of the times of first importance and

greatest power. This was the secret of its success. It was this that made it, as Mr. Leslie Stephen says, "by far the most important phenomenon of the eighteenth century," and gave it that reactive force "upon other bodies" which, he adds, "was as important as its direct influence."

Such are the relations of theology and psychology that changes or modifications in the former will work corresponding changes or modifications in the latter. Especially is this true of any modification of the conception of God, or of the human mind. That the Wesleyan conception of both God and man differed from that of Augustine, Calvin, Luther, and the Church of the eighteenth century, is a fact that will not be called in question. It is equally plain that that conception has entered into, and in a large degree leavened, all theological thought and teaching. That it should affect psychological inquiry and modify philosophic systems was but a natural and necessary result. A true philosophy must proceed, not as Augustine's did, from God manward, but from man Godward. It must have its foundation in a true analysis of the human mind. In the Arminian or Wesleyan theology more than in any other system, moral freedom is the predominant factor in the complex conception of man. It emphasizes also, not only the value of experience, or consciousness, but its authority as a witness to the phenomena of the inner life. How much the psychology of the present time is indebted for its healthful tone to the Wesleyan emphasis of these two doctrines it is impossible to determine. But that to it belongs in a large measure the credit of the liberation of both philosophy and religion from the blight of necessitarianism will not be doubted. Some future history of philosophy will mark the Wesleyan period as the beginning of a psychological as well as religious epoch.

The fact that Methodism thus modified doctrinal systems that had all the prestige of antiquity, and were accepted and defended by the genius and learning of the greatest men the Church had produced, is sufficient evidence that it was not merely emotional in its origin. It embodied principles that were in profounder harmony with the religious consciousness of men, and therefore mightier, than the ancient beliefs. Those beliefs had survived the shocks and vicissitudes of centuries: that they should be displaced or modified by a sudden outburst

of emotion is as inconceivable as that the granite bowlder should be dislodged and ground to powder by a dash of spray. Emotion is ephemeral in its manifestations, and uncertain in its operation and issues; one hundred and fifty years have witnessed no abatement of the forces of Methodism, nor obliteration of any of its original distinctive characteristics. Isaac Taylor assigns fifty years as "the extreme limit of the personal energy and influence" of the originators "of those revolutions that mark the history of the human mind," and adds: "Never hitherto has any new impulse, or any strenuous moral movement, been taken up and carried forward by the sons and successors of its originators, in the same mind, or with the same, or with nearly the same, singleness of purpose." He affirms also that the peculiar relationship of Methodists of the present day to "the fathers and founders of their communion appears, to the eye of the impartial by-stander, to be made up more of what is technical, or conventional, than of what is substantial in a purely religious sense." Mr. Taylor does not define *substantial* for his readers; but it may be assumed that as a philosopher he used the term to denote that which was original and essential in the Methodist movement—its underlying, originating, and formative principles, without which it could not have been. If this was his meaning, then it may be shown that he made his assertion without a careful analysis of the facts of Methodist history. In "what is technical, or conventional," there may have been divergences; in what is *substantial*, Methodism has preserved its unity and identity.

Its doctrinal basis has undergone no change. No stone placed in its foundation by Mr. Wesley has been removed; none has been added. Watson's "Institutes" is but a systematic development of the theology of Wesley's "Sermons" and "Notes." Advance have been made in philology and biblical criticism, in history and philosophy; but the theology of William Burt Pope, D.D., a magnificent compendium of which is given in the article on "Methodist Doctrine," rests squarely on the foundation laid by Wesley, and is of a piece with the superstructure reared by Watson. And in all the branches of the Methodist family, however much they may differ in polity, there is but one faith. Individuals differ on questions of speculative theology, or in those intellectual speculations which have

reference merely to the manner of explaining that which is fundamental; but with respect to that which is essential there is not nor has there ever been any serious divergence. Nor has there been any change of opinion with respect to the relative position and importance of the doctrines of Methodism in its system, either theoretically or practically. The doctrines which Mr. Wesley emphasized are emphasized to-day—not, it may be, with the same constancy, but with a strength of conviction no less complete and controlling.

Doctrine is the subsoil on which rests experience. As the former has maintained its integrity through all the history of Methodism, so has the latter. Bishop Foss has written eloquently of "Wesley and Personal Religious Experience." Such experience he characterizes as "the grand formative principle of Methodism; its central, uniting, explaining idea, without which it could not have been." That there have been changes of opinion and practice with respect to some of the conventional means whereby experience may be developed is undeniable. But as to experience itself, the privilege of its enjoyment, and the importance of enjoying, cultivating, and maturing it in order to the strength and force of religious character and life, Methodism has suffered no relapse. It is written in its latest as well as its oldest books; it is preached from its thousands of pulpits in city and country no less truly than by Wesley himself in the Old Foundry, or on Moorfield Common; and it is enjoyed in its preciousness and power by multitudes to-day as really as by any of those who through his preaching believed on the name of the Son of God. Justification by faith, the witness of the Spirit, peace, joy, rest, triumph in Christ, the cleansing of the soul from all sin by the blood of the cross, are now, as then, facts written in the spiritual history of thousands.

Experience is the soil out of which comes the life with all its activities. "Christ in you the hope of glory," is the inspiration of Christian toil, self-denial, endurance, and devotion. The joy of the Lord is the strength of his people—their strength for work and for suffering. This experience in Wesley unfolded itself in a life unexampled in activity and fruitfulness since the days of Paul. Indeed, that great apostle was not more abundant in labors than the apostle of Methodism. John

Wesley laid all his powers on the altar; Paul did no more. Both alike counted all things but loss for Christ; and neither sought any higher honor or knew any deeper joy than to glorify Christ and do good to men. And Methodism from that day until now has not been wanting in lives of like devotedness. Many a follower of Wesley is as thoroughly consecrated as he was, and is as pure in life and in all manner of conversation. The fruits of righteousness are as abundant and no less perfect now than then. What work of Wesley for the elevation and salvation of men has not been taken up and vigorously pressed forward by his sons? The mantle of Elijah may not have fallen on any single Elisha; but his spirit has been breathed into a multitude, and their aggregated forces have wrought results of which he never dreamed. When he went to his reward Methodism counted 550 preachers and 140,000 members—the astonishing fruit of about sixty years' toil. To-day it numbers over 50,000 preachers, 8,000,000 communicants and 12,000,000 hearers, or about one sixtieth of the human race! Six years before his death he said of his people that they "walked by one rule, knowing religion is holy tempers; and striving to worship God, not in form only, but likewise in spirit and in truth"—words equally applicable to the great mass of his followers now.

Doctrine, experience, and life—these comprise all that was substantial and essential in the Methodism of the fathers and founders of the communion; and in the possession of these, in their original integrity, the Methodism of the present demonstrates its oneness with that of the past. Nor "is it going forward now, commingled with other moral forces, and having its own abated," as Taylor suggests. It is quickening, modifying, and assimilating all other evangelic forces. It has swelled the ranks of other communions directly by thousands, indirectly by hundreds of thousands. It has relegated doctrines once most prominent in the instructions of the pulpit to merited obscurity. It has breathed life and kindled a holy enthusiasm where before was nothing but the rigidity of a dead orthodoxy, or the delusion of a self-complacent formalism. But the process from first to last has been one of assimilation, and not of abatement or loss of its own inherent and distinctive forces. It has methodized others without unmethodizing

itself, and thus given to evangelical Christendom its mightiest impulse to a grand, complete spiritual unity in Christ.

One in doctrine, experience, life, and aims, there may be, and ought to be, genuinely fraternal relations established and maintained among all the branches of the Methodist family. Consistency demands it; the honor of Christ and the mission of Methodism demand it. While unitizing others, Methodism within its own household should "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace." The coming Ecumenical Conference is an omen of a closer union and a deeper fellowship. The "Wesley Memorial Volume" points in the same direction; and the WESLEY MONUMENTAL CHURCH, while commemorating the past, will stand as a perpetual memorial of the brotherhood of the Methodisms of the world. A godspeed to all the agencies and movements "which make for peace" and "love unfeigned!"

ART. VII.—THAKOMBAU, CANNIBAL AND CHRISTIAN.

The King and People of Fiji. By Rev. JOSEPH WATERHOUSE. London: Wesleyan Conference Office.

THE beautiful islands forming the subject of Mr. Waterhouse's deeply interesting book have been the scene of one of the most signal triumphs ever achieved by the Christian religion. They are one hundred and fifty in number, of which one hundred are inhabited by a population variously estimated at from one hundred and fifty thousand to three hundred thousand, the two largest being Viti Levu, (Great Fiji,) eighty-five miles by forty, and Vanua Levu, (Great Land,) ninety-five miles by thirty. Of all the Polynesians the Fijians were addicted to a most inveterate cannibalism, and had, in consequence, become characterized by an almost ineradicable and hopeless ferocity, when, less than fifty years ago, they received for the first time the visit of a Christian missionary. In 1835 a prudential agreement was come to between the Wesleyan Missionary and the London Missionary Societies, whereby the former were left in sole possession of the group for Protestant missionary work. The Rev. Messrs. Cross and Cargill were the first Wesleyan missionaries, who were succeeded by Messrs. Hunt, Calvert, Waterhouse, Lyth, Williams, Hazlewood, Wats-

ford, Wilson, and others. The complete triumph of Christianity over heathenism cannot be said to have been gained for twenty years after the establishment of the mission; for, although considerable success had attended the arduous labors of the heroic missionaries, it was not till 1854 that Thakombau, the King of Bau, embraced Christianity. For his conversion unfaltering efforts had been put forth, the missionaries believing, as the sequel proved, that the renunciation of cannibal heathenism in favor of Christianity by one of immense personal authority, irresistible force of character, and overpowering military reputation, would be attended with immediate and very decided results favorable to the Christianization of the entire people.

Formerly the two Fijian powers were centered in Verata and Rewa, towns of Viti Levu; subsequently there rose into power an independent and warlike kingdom known by the name of Bau. Bau had its sacred king, *Roko Tui Bau*, (the reverenced King of Bau,) who was relieved from all warlike engagements, but held to be bound to uphold religion, and especially to maintain cannibalism. After him came another monarch, *Vunivalu*, (the root of war,) the military commander and State officer. These two kings were advised by *Tunitoga*, who was also their spokesman. As the guardian of all the daughters of the kings and chiefs, he was the State match-maker, and disposed absolutely of all the young chieftainesses in marriage. Next in the social scale were the *Bete*, the priests, and the *Matanivanu*, the royal messengers. To Bau, the priests said, had the gods given the pre-eminence among Fijian kingdoms, which was accordingly known by the title of the "God-land," and regarded by multitudes with feelings of deep religious veneration. Good fortune awaited it, and, as was meet, the sacred city attained an enviable prosperity. To it distant provinces paid the tribute of handsome women and spacious canoes, so that Bau came to glory in its female beauty and its magnificent fleet. The island became crowded as the permanent dwelling of an increasing and influential population, building for themselves large and spacious houses, without partitions or upper rooms, in an irregular and crowded fashion. Thirty heathen temples reared their showy heads ornamented with white cowry shells; but

no resting-place for the dead was deemed necessary, save the royal mausoleum, for the earthen floors of the dwelling-houses were regarded as furnishing a sufficient separation of the dead from the living. Three market-places had been provided, which, in addition to the purposes of trade, were used in furtherance of general intercourse, and as human slaughter-houses. Distinguished among the islands for its warlike and commercial superiority, it has become equally celebrated for its devotion to the rites of a cannibalistic religion. The sound of the drum is the signal for a feast on human flesh; and old and young run together to gaze on a naked victim just clubbed, then dashed against a stone in front of the temple, prior to being cut up and divided, if possible before life is quite extinct. Or if still alive, he is thrown into an oven and partly cooked. If decapitated, the children eagerly contend for the head to play ball with it, and a superstitious mother begs a morsel of skin with which to rub the lips of her little one as a sacred preservation of her child's health. The decease of a husband must be honored by the death of his widows. First painted, dressed, and caressed, they are strangled by suffocation, preferring death to remarriage, that they may avoid harsh treatment, on rejoining their lord, for having displayed so little affection as to remain long on earth after his death. A sick man or woman felt to be burdensome is sure to be partially suffocated, then buried alive. Tokens of respect for a deceased chief must be supplied unstintedly, so that placed in a row over the door-way of his former dwelling as many as twenty fingers, amputated from as many individuals, may be counted.

Over this flourishing and religious "God-land" Tanoa reigned, to whom, in 1817, the young Prince Thakombau was born. Unrestrained jubilations attended his birth, not moderated by the death of his mother a few weeks after. The queens of Rewa nourished and feasted him; feasted him on being for the first time washed in water from the sea, when he first turned over of himself, and when first he showed he had strength to creep. As he grew he became tyrannical and audacious. "Does he wish to take an airing? A man must carry him on his shoulders. Is he inclined for sleep? The women must fan him, and soothingly press his untired feet. Is he angry with his nurse? He may strike her. Does he

quarrel with his playmate? He may bite, strike, or maim with impunity. Does a slave accidentally interrupt his pleasure? He may fearlessly draw his bow and send an arrow at the intruder." Without any provocation, his father would cause large numbers of men to be killed and eaten. In visiting an island he would refuse to land until assured that a sufficient number of men had been killed to do honor to him; while on launching his canoe for any distinguished visit or important adventure, he would cause a number of bodies to be prepared beforehand, in time to have it launched by being dragged over them into the water. Under such a training the youthful Thakombau (now known by the name of Seru) grew up a blood-thirsty monster. How far his cannibalistic whims and fancies had been indulged may be gathered from his requiring on one occasion, while yet a youth, that the tongue of a rebel chief should be cut out while yet alive, which he devoured raw, gayly chatting and joking the while with the mutilated man, whose entreaties for a speedy death he answered by prolonged, cruel torments, finally satisfying his savage hunger by having him cooked and eaten.

Such was Thakombau, who, though not yet king, his father being still and for many years after alive, had already gained immense power, when, in 1835, the Rev. David Cargill, M. A., and Mr. William Cross invaded Fiji in furtherance of His warfare whose weapons are "not carnal, but spiritual." Soon discerning the premier position in rank and influence to which Bau had been advanced among the islands of the group, Mr. Cross formed the design of commencing a mission there, if he could but gain the consent of the young prince. The answer given to the request to be allowed to reside in his dominion was, "It will be most agreeable to me, if you think well; but I will not hide it from you that I am now engaged in war, and cannot attend to your instructions, or even assure you of safety." The missionary concluded, in the face of such an answer, that it would be unadvisable to enter upon his mission; a conclusion that would probably be the more speedily come to from the fact that the cannibal king and his attendants were at the same hour glutting their ferocious appetites upon the cooked bodies of the two rebels, those of two others being yet in the native ovens for the further gratification of their

hyena-like propensities. Subsequently, however, it was found that Mr. Cross had, through ignorance, given offense to Thakombau in thus deciding. The answer it appeared was intended to express permission to take up his residence in Bau, though, of course, the missionary did not so interpret it. Thakombau wished to be regarded as having displayed remarkable condescension in granting permission at all; and that it should not be made use of, he interpreted as distrust of his ability to protect him from his own enemies, or else distrust of his promise. He conceived himself slighted, and for fifteen years resisted appeals from other missionaries for the same privilege.

Eighteen months after, the missionaries in the other islands of the group having become seven in number, a second application for permission was made, this time to Tanoa, Thakombau's father, who, partly from fear of his son, refused it, alleging, "The island is small, the people foolish. I fear they will take your property from you. Water and fire-wood are difficult to obtain." With characteristic courage Mr. Cross answered: "The smallness of this island, the distance of food and water, are not difficulties to me; as for the people, I do not fear them. I fear no one but God; and if you will only give your consent, I will be in Bau in three days." The king now gave an unqualified refusal, and the missionary turned away to Viwa, a beautiful island two miles from Bau. Tanoa, however, permitted the missionaries to pay occasional visits to his island, and would have built them a mission-house but for the stern opposition of his son, which, on one occasion, found expression in the menacing words to one of the missionaries, "When you have grown *dalo* on yon bare rock, then I will become a Christian, and not before." Meanwhile, his evil determination gained strength by cannibalistic indulgences. By strategy he caused one hundred natives of Namena to be massacred, and their bodies taken to Bau, where they were cooked and eaten. To accompany these to the land of spirits it was deemed necessary to strangle eighty women. At the same time that Thakombau became more active and determined in warfare, he developed a finished refinement in torture. The "Wesleyan Missionary Notices" supply the following revolting illustration in connection with the Namena massacre: Two men, unfortunately taken alive, after being doomed to death,

were ordered to dig a hole in the earth for the purpose of making a native oven, and were required to cut fire-wood to roast their own bodies. They were then directed to go and wash, and afterward to make a cup of the banana leaf, which, from opening a vein in each person, was soon filled with blood. This blood was drank in the presence of the sufferers by the Kaba people. Thakombau then had their arms and legs cut off and eaten, some of which were presented to them. He then ordered a fish-hook to be put into their tongues, which were drawn out as far as possible, and then cut off; these were roasted and eaten, amid the taunt, "We are eating your tongues." As life was not extinct an incision was made in the side, and the bowels taken out; which soon terminated their sufferings.

Along with all this was a most superstitious reverence for the Fijian deities. Thakombau's great anxiety to secure their approbation showed itself in launching a canoe, when, an accident having happened, he offered no less than twenty-one human sacrifices to appease their wrath. But his absorbing occupation was war. From the vessels calling at Fiji he purchased neither clothing nor food, but muskets, cannon, powder, balls, lead, and spirituous liquors. One Jackson, who at this time paid a visit to him, thus records it in Ruskin's "Islands of the Western Pacific:"

Thakombau having asked me to cast him a thousand balls of lead for his muskets, I agreed, and went to his house, where I was surprised to see upwards of twenty chests of different sorts with a good many china trunks, forty or fifty pigs of lead, and upward of two hundred kegs of powder. I asked where he got all these things from. He said he considered himself very badly off, and wished some *beché-de-mer* vessels would come so that he could make up his standing quantity of powder, which he said was six hundred kegs, with pigs of lead in proportion. He also said he had five thousand muskets, but that he had distributed them all but a few among his people. He then gave me a bunch of keys and told me to unlock the chests, and I would find every thing requisite for running the bullets. I found three or four large bullet molds, all of American manufacture, of brass, to run a dozen balls at a time, together with pots, ladles, and every thing else. I soon completed my task and gave him satisfaction. He asked me to stop in Bau with him, his father and brothers, and consider it my home; that I could go to any part of the Fijis I thought proper, and yet be under his pro-

tection; and by and by, when a vessel came, he should buy a cask of rum and we should drink it together. He appeared to me at first to be a very good fellow, and, in fact, he was so to me, but I was not long of discovering him to be a great tyrant to his people.

Thus Thakombau grew to be a monster warrior, the terror of all Fiji. Yet missionaries did not abandon him, nor permit themselves to be awed into silence by his rapidly acquired influence. One day the Rev. John Hunt ("the apostle of Fiji") obtained an interview with him, and finding him in a pacific mood, felt encouraged to converse with him, after making his request for permission to allow a missionary at Bau, as follows:

Thakombau. If I am first to become a Christian among my people, I shall be first in heaven, shall I not?

Hunt. If you love God the most, and serve him the best, you may have a higher place in heaven.

Thakombau. But Namasimalua has become a Christian. Have you given him glass windows for his new house, and English carpets for his floors, and have you sent to England for a vessel for him? He gets no riches because he has renounced heathenism.

Hunt. We do not come here to give riches to those who become Christians, but to tell you about God and Jesus Christ, that you may love him, and your souls be saved.

Thakombau. Then I will not become a Christian. What will become of the bodies of those who have been eaten, and of those who have been buried? Will they rise again from the dead?

Hunt. Your body, the bodies of all those whom you have eaten, and the bodies of all who are in the graves, will rise again at the day of judgment; and if you and they have not repented you will all be condemned and cast into hell-fire.

Thakombau. Ah, well! it is a fine thing to have a fire in cold weather.

Hunt. I shall pray for you with a good mind, although you treat the subject so lightly.

Thakombau. Go on with that.

A short while after this interview Thakombau became greatly enraged on learning that his companion in arms, Varina, chief of Viwa, with many of his people, had accepted Christianity, and determined on taking revenge. Arriving at Viwa for that intent, he ordered Namasimalua, Varina's counselor, into his presence, who obeyed, showing his respect by creeping into the house on hands and knees. "Split his head with an ax!" cried the savage Thakombau, as Namasimalua approached him. At this moment Mr. Hunt's voice was heard, in pacific,

respectful terms, saying, "My love to you, sir!" The missionary's object in securing a diversion and gaining time was accomplished, and the opportunity taken to induce the monster to abandon his cruel purpose. All the day warriors, armed with clubs and muskets, were arriving, but so effective was the pleading of the missionaries that, as the numbers increased the purpose wavered, until the admission was made, "We came to kill these people, and we cannot lift a hand!" Under the shadow of night they quietly withdrew to Bau, acknowledging that "the Christian's God was too strong for them." Passing through the bush to the canoes, many of the Viwans, whom they had come to destroy, carried for them the clubs which had been brought for the death-dealing work.

Hitherto unimpressible, the untamable monster was now giving signs of contrition. In 1847 Rev. Walter Lawry, General Superintendent of Wesleyan Missions, visited Fiji, and found him, upon the whole, favorable to the mission. Mr. Lawry said of him that war and feasting upon human bodies was his delight; but that he even went so far as to promise that he would one day abandon heathenism and embrace the Gospel; a promise which Mr. L. regarded as to some extent sincere because he had ceased to blaspheme the Christian religion, as had been his habit formerly. He also, about this time, took an amusing method of evincing an evident respect for it, by punishing a woman of his household who, having first embraced Christianity and afterward apostatized, offered in mockery to preach a sermon, and made a beginning; but the king hearing her, peremptorily stopped her, saying, "You shall not ridicule the *lotu* here. Religion is true, and a weighty matter, not to be trifled with." To this remonstrance he added punishment in a novel fashion. Standing near was a huge *bêche-de-mer* pot, which he ordered his attendants to turn over upon the woman, under which, coiled and cramped, she remained in terror all night, not daring to stir until orders for her release were given by Thakombau himself. The personal influence of the Rev. John Hunt over him was also of a very favorable character. It is quite evident that Thakombau regarded Mr. Cross as his personal enemy, because of the affront he ignorantly gave him in refusing to take up his residence at Bau on first seeking permission to do so. In an interview, which lasted four hours,

the powerful chief vehemently asseverated that he never would become a Christian. "But your children will," said Mr. Cross. "They shall not," was the immediate reply; "for I will, on my death-bed, enjoin them not to change their religion." To Mr. Hunt, on the contrary, he gave great heed, allowing him to hold regular divine service on the Sabbath in Bau, and even giving permission to one of his children not only to embrace Christianity, but likewise to receive religious instruction at his hands. "We are at war," said he to him on one occasion, "and cannot attend to Christianity at present;" and on another, "You can go to any part of our dominions, but we at Bau shall not become Christians at present." The different relations of Messrs. Cross and Hunt to this self-willed and ferocious chief very clearly show the great value to a missionary of a personal influence which shall operate favorably to his work; and in the case of the latter there can be no doubt that the power for good he had brought to bear upon Thakombau while living was increased when, in 1848, he ceased from his labors, and, as he did so, left as his dying message the instruction: "Tell the king that I love him. I entreat him not to forget his oft-repeated promise to me that he would become a Christian. Tell him that religion is profitable." Before Mr. Hunt died, Thakombau acknowledged the secret of his power over him to have lain in his amiable and self-sacrificing disposition, by the remark he once made when speaking of him, "He is a loving man." That was the conquest of the missionary over the cannibal; the conquest of the Gospel every-where—*love.*

But submission was not yet. Hunt's influence was personal, at the same time that it was in favor of Christianity. Yet there were many reasons to the proud and cruel monster why he should not place himself under the latter. He was Fiji's great chief; history told of no greater; and if he were not a god already, he would become one at his death. But the Christians regarded him as a mere man, not over good at that. Then, again, they would not assist him in his wars; and as the natives of other islands became Christian, they told him they could not give him the assistance in warfare which he had long ago regarded as beyond any question his. That they should refuse to fight for him was as preposterous as it was aggravating. Accordingly, he rightly concluded that as the Fijians

abandoned the faith of their fathers he became a sufferer by the loss of political and martial influence. His pride could not brook this, and he resolved upon the extirpation of all the natives who had become Christian. The missionaries and their families—thanks to the influence of the departed Hunt—were to be spared, but all the native disciples were to be put to death. War was declared and actually entered upon, and the entreaties of the missionaries against it treated with contempt. It happened that at the time (1851) a Tongan chief with three hundred men was at Bau. The missionaries besought his influence with Thakombau, and in the consequent interview he informed the latter that he would feel called upon to defend them if he judged their lives to be imperiled by the war. Thakombau, fearing a contest with Tongans as well as the Christian Fijians, saw it to be politic to bring warlike operations to a close, and although siege had been laid to Dama, it was raised and peace proclaimed. At the same time he cursed both the missionaries and the Tongans, secretly vowing to carry out his bloody designs at a more opportune season.

In the same year a further step in advance was taken. One Sabbath in March the Rev. Joseph Waterhouse was conducting divine service in a house when he was greatly alarmed by a shower of stones upon it, which he thought for the time would bury him. As soon as possible most of the congregation fled in terror, among those remaining being a chief of rank, whose indignation found vent in the exclamation, "Am I a pig, that I should be stoned?" But the stoning had been done by order of Thakombau himself, and when the courageous Waterhouse learned this he determined to accuse the tyrant of it. In company with the Rev. J. Calvert, another devoted missionary—who at the time trembled for his friend's safety—he dealt faithfully with the persecuting king. In spite of his denial of it Mr. Waterhouse reiterated the charge, and threatened the judgments of heaven upon him if he persisted in opposing the work of the Lord. The king listened with astonishment, and the faithful missionary, encouraged by the evident embarrassment of his unwilling listener, followed up his reproof by making a threefold demand: 1. That he should receive a missionary; 2. That he should allow public worship at Bau every Sabbath; 3. That he should declare freedom of con-

science in matters of religion. Says the missionary: "Thakombau was thunderstruck, and I immovable. At last he yielded, and the day was apparently gained." But, as yet, not really gained. Though a site had been granted and preparations made for the erection of a church, the native priests, in the course of a few weeks, persuaded the king to reverse his decision. For this breach of faith Mr. Waterhouse expostulated with him for a couple of hours, but in vain. Finding it impossible to induce him to return to his promise, he concluded the interview by reminding him that they two, and the native priests who had influenced him, would one day meet before the judgment-seat of God, to which the contemptuous king replied in derision, "O! I suppose a vessel from the other world has arrived in England. You seem to be well up in information from the day of judgment!" Often reproved, he was yet too much of a rebel against God to submit.

It was at this time that a papal bishop visited Fiji, and tried to induce Thakombau to receive a French Romanist missionary. The friendship of the king was solicited by the presentation of a couple of muskets, but the request, which it was hoped the present would be likely to extort from the warrior, was sternly refused. Alluding to the failure of the Protestant missionaries to obtain their long-sought permission, the bishop inquired of the king how it was that it had been denied them. Receiving a negative reply, the bishop vouchsafed the information that "the Virgin Mary was keeping Bau for the Catholics, and that when Thakombau became a Catholic he would have to order the Protestants to change their faith." The king's ready rejoinder was, that the bishop had better be gone and leave him and his city to the care of the Virgin, and to come again when she had converted them!

Tanoa, Thakombau's father, did not die until December 8, 1852, when the latter became king in title, as he had for many years been in every other respect. The death of a king was an occasion when heathen rites could not possibly be dispensed with, however hesitating the attitude of Thakombau had become toward the heathen religion. The old man died with the faint inquiry on his lips, how many would be strangled to accompany his spirit to his fathers; and the son determined that his royal parent should not be unhonored in his death, and so

subject to the reproaches of all Fiji. The Rev. John Watsford, who happened to be, at the time, the only missionary near to Bau, at once made his way to the royal residence, only to learn, as he feared, that Thakombau had given orders for the performance of the usual bloody custom. Says Mr. Waterhouse:

The principal widow was a lifeless corpse, with the strangling drapery round her neck. A second was in the midst of death, her strangulation being effected by the prince himself and his companions. Two or three were pulling the cord on either side, while a lady of rank, forgetting her Christianity in her desire to honor her royal relative, pressed down the covered head. Just as the third was making her appearance Thakombau recognized the missionary. "How now!" exclaimed the prince. "Refrain, sir," said Mr. Watsford, with tears in his eyes and compassion beaming from his whole countenance. "Two are already strangled; let them suffice; spare the remainder. I love them." "We also love them," replied Thakombau. "But there are only a few—only five. But for you missionaries many more would have been strangled." The third lady then bade farewell to her relatives and knelt down. The cord was then adjusted, the covering thrown over her, and she died without a sound or struggle. Two others followed. All this was effected without the slightest noise, hurry, or confusion. A stranger might have supposed it to have been a wedding of the living rather than of the dead. Yet [continues Mr. Waterhouse reflectively] the voice of conscience made itself heard. For several days Thakombau was frequently engaged in talking about the departed women, and expressing his wonder whether mankind will know each other in the eternal world."

Still the king continued his cannibalistic and warlike pursuits; but, as if the judgments were overtaking him, to bring about his humiliation preparatory to his accepting the Saviour, he had to contend with the rebellion of a portion of his subjects, and sustain the loss of Bau by fire. Hoping to find him in a somewhat softened mood, the Rev. Messrs. Lyth, Watsford, and Waterhouse obtained an interview with him, to press once more upon him their offer of a missionary. But, proud and contemptuous as ever, he refused the permission as before, telling the deputation that no missionary should ever reside at Bau, though his habitation were merely an empty oil-cask. The missionaries, however, did not relax their importunities, but on every suitable occasion renewed them. The proud warrior's successes in war were not so frequent as of yore, and a series

of reverses of various kinds overtook him in rapid succession for the next two years. On October 30, 1853, Mr. Waterhouse obtained another interview, at which the long-delayed consent was granted to him, after a promise had been made to the Rev. James Calvert to the same purport a few days before. The following conversation passed between Mr. W. and the king:

Mr. Waterhouse. As you, sir, are now willing to build a mission-house, and have sent for me to reside at Bau, I have come to report my arrival.

King. 'Twas Mr. Calvert's mind, not mine.

Mr. Waterhouse. Don't trifle with me, sir. Mr. Calvert brought your message to me, in consequence of which I have come.

King. No, no; not my message, but his own.

Mr. Waterhouse. Impossible! But what am I to do?

King. Do? Go and live at Viwa for the present.

Mr. Waterhouse. Chief, listen to me for a few moments. You have frequently befooled the missionaries. For years we have listened to you, and have kept a missionary uselessly waiting until you would build him a house at Bau. We can be played with no longer. I, myself, have left an island where your countrymen, though heathens and cannibals like yourself, love and respect me as a missionary; the dead have been given me for burial, and the lives of many been spared at my intercession. I know that you will not be very ready to follow their example, for you told my father that you would destroy and kill as long as your life lasted. But if you will build me a house, though I may labor without success, yet I will reside with you, and endeavor to do you good.

King. Very well; don't be angry. Go to Viwa, and when we are at leisure we will build your house.

Mr. Waterhouse. Angry I am not, as the king well knows. But I reprove you publicly on the present occasion, as private expostulation has failed. Please oblige me with a house in which to deposit my books, furniture, etc.

King. Bau is quite full; we have no room. Go to Viwa.

Mr. Waterhouse. I must now respectfully but firmly inform the king that he must be pleased to furnish me with a shed for my goods, and also to send a canoe to the vessel for the said goods, or I shall be compelled to return to Ovalau to-morrow. The king cannot have forgotten that the goods belonging to the missionary Watsford were brought to Bau, with the king's full consent, who then refused to allow of the landing of the same. To guard against a similar mishap, the king must be pleased in this instance to dispatch his own men to the vessel, more especially as the brig is six miles distant.

King, (*inwardly agitated, but endeavoring to maintain an outward composure.*) Don't talk like that. Perhaps the Manilla man would lend his store hut to you.

The missionary's effects were landed at the command of the king, and temporarily stored in the building referred to him, and a house afterward built on the Banan summit. The erection of this house was largely due to the influence of the queen over the king in the missionary's favor. Henceforward, divine service was conducted twice every Lord's day in the mission-house. The missionaries' efforts for the conversion of Thakombau were now seconded by a letter from the Tongan King George, who strongly advised him to become a Christian. His principal queen, Adi Samanunu, used her influence to the same end, though exposed to much ridicule from most of the favorites of the regal harem, who taunted her with wanting to escape the strangling which would take place at the death of her lord; while others accused her of the design of securing him to herself as his sole wife, and for that reason desired him to become a Christian. Soon came the decision. On April 27, 1854, the missionary had a prolonged interview with him, and faithfully and affectionately dealt with him as a sinner before God. The Lord had evidently been at work by his Spirit upon the proud savage's heart, for he wept profusely before his faithful reprover. "Will not God cast me off," he tearfully inquired, "if I call upon his name whom I have so ill-treated?" Then, with a spirit of meekness never before displayed by him, he announced his decision to accept the offers of God's mercy; and the missionary, excited with thankfulness and joy, left him. The day following, at a full meeting of the chiefs and governors from adjacent towns on the mainland, the king announced his decision; and at a meeting of his male relatives and principal chiefs on the following day, it was resolved that the religion of Christ should be substituted for that of their fathers. Bales of native calicoes were opened and distributed among those who wished to clothe themselves, and provision was shared out among those who intended to renounce heathenism.

That was a memorable Sabbath that followed, April 30, 1854, but it is fitting that Mr. Waterhouse should himself describe its services:

It was one of Fiji's loveliest cloudless days. Early in the morning the mission family arrived from Viwa, including Mr. and Mrs. Calvert and their children, and Mr. E. P. Martin, whose hearty and praiseworthy labors in the printing department have

greatly enriched all Fiji. The word was passed to "beat the drum." The sound thrilled the hearts of all. The two great wooden drums of Fiji—known to the natives by the name of "the publisher of war"—had never before been used but to congregate warriors and cannibals. Their sounds had often betokened death to the living captives who awaited the strong arm of their human butchers to relieve them from their awful suspense; their piercing "pat-pat-pat" had resounded when two hundred victims were piled in a heap, and had rolled as an accompaniment at all the bloody orgies of Bau. These drums are now beaten to assemble those who were willing to enroll themselves under the banner of the Prince of peace.

The place set apart for the public service was the large dwelling (one hundred and twenty feet by thirty feet) known as the Strangers' House. In front is the Bau assembly grounds, in which the reviews are generally held. At the back are a number of ovens for cooking human flesh, now filled up, it is hoped, forever. Near these is a large tree on which are notched the number of those who have been cooked and eaten; it is covered from top to bottom with these mementos of Fijian disgrace. Close by are the evergreen shrubs where certain portions of the eaten parties were hung as ornaments, and were now removed for the first time. This was the spot where the message of love to God and to man was now publicly proclaimed. The king, preceded by his gray-headed, long-bearded family priest, first entered the dwelling. About three hundred chiefs, women, attendants, and children, followed the ruler. His own children sat in the front, his wives and sisters, the other women of rank, and all the females, on the right hand; the king and all of his sex occupied the left. The change in the people was very striking. All had clean faces and were suitably clad. True, the long beards of the men and the well-dressed heads of hair of both men and women remained; but the congregation was orderly, serious, and attentive. Previous to the commencement of worship, the chiefs respectfully removed their snow-white turbans.

The Revs. James Calvert and Joseph Waterhouse were the preachers who delivered God's message of mercy to sinners with profound and conflicting emotions. The next day family prayer was established in many of the natives' houses, and on the following Sabbath three hundred more embraced the Christian religion. The despoiling of the heathen temples and the destruction of trees in the sacred forests were works accomplished not without fear and trembling on the part of those natives to whom they were committed. Langa, the god of rain and of fine weather, found a place in the mission house, whither he was borne in triumph. Public day-schools for

teaching reading and writing were at once commenced, at which some of the young men learned to read in three days. So rapidly was heathenism renounced that by June 1 more than a thousand had placed themselves under the religious instruction of the missionary.

As might be expected, Thakombau did not escape persecution and annoyance from his enemies, in bearing which he acknowledged that he deserved death for his great crimes, and evinced a humble and teachable disposition, though it was some time ere he could display a forgiving spirit toward his implacable foes. By the advice of Mr. Waterhouse he at once gave himself to the initiation of a scheme of political reform formed upon a Christian basis, though he rejected all proposals in favor of constitutional government with the characteristic remark, "I was born a chief, and I will die a chief." In 1870–71 an attempt was made to set up a sort of native European government, but it proved a failure. Since then, however, Fiji has become a dependency of England which has been ably presided over by Sir Arthur Gordon, who, at this writing, is being removed to New Zealand.

Thakombau having become a Christian, the one formidable obstruction in the way of Christianity triumphing over Fiji no longer barred the way, and now there gather every Sabbath one hundred thousand natives to hear the word of life. The Fijian group is one of the Gospel's greatest triumphs, and with the certainty of effect following cause, commerce has begun to tread with vigorous steps in the wake of religion. To those who once knew Fiji as unclean and cannibal, the change is marvelous. They remember that the first greeting given to some of them was a chuckle of delight as cannibal fingers tested their fitness for the oven; now they witness law, order, religion, and trade, exerting regnant powers where life had no respect shown it. Twenty-three years ago, Missionary Wilson, running short of bread and shoes, had to take a voyage one hundred miles out and one hundred miles back with the result of a "stone of flour and a pair of old shoes that might have belonged to the Gibeonites." Then there was neither merchant nor trader nor store. In 1878 Fiji's shipping amounted to twenty-three thousand one hundred and eighty tons, trading in goods to the value of £329,573. To Fiji herself, to the Australian colonies,

and to the British Empire the gain has been beyond all estimate in both material and spiritual interests, and it is no boast to say that that gain is the result of the Wesleyan mission work there, upon which so signally rested the enriching blessing of the Most High God.

Art. VIII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Reviews.

Baptist Review, April, May, June, 1881. (Cincinnati.)—1. Testimony of the Mesopotamian Monuments to the Reliability of the Sacred Scriptures; by Rev. G. E. Lesson. 2. The Acta Johannis—the New Edition by Prof. Zahn; by Prof. H. M. Schaffer. 3. Commerce and Literature; by W. Carey Crane, D.D. LL.D. 4. What Latitude of Belief is Allowed by the Doctrine of Inspiration; by Rev. O. P. Eaches. 5. Balthazer Hubmeyer; by Rev. W. W. Everts, Jun. 6. Theism; by Wayland Hoyt, D.D. 7. Thomas Carlyle; by Rev. Philip L. Jones.

Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly, April, 1881. (Lebanon, Tenn.)—1. Ministerial Education; by Prof. S. T. Anderson, D. D. 2. The Supernatural; by S. H. Buchanan, D.D. 3. The Possibilities of Faith; by Rev. S. L. Russell. 4. Tobacco; by Prof. J. I. D. Hinds, Ph.D. 5. The Presbyterian Alliance and the Cumberland Presbyterian Church; by Prof. R. V. Foster. 6. Theopneusty; by Rev. C. P. Duvall. 7. H. M. Irwin's Criticism on "Mosaic Jurisprudence;" by Hon. R. C. Ewing. 8. Prof. James M'Greggor, D.D., on the Cumberland Presbyterian Confession of Faith; by Prof. S. G. Burney, D.D. 9. Notes.—Christ's Miracles, Spurious Zeal, Catechetics, Revivals; by Prof. R. V. Foster. The Eldership.

Lutheran Quarterly, April, 1881. (Gettysburgh.)—1. Feasibility of a Service for all English-Speaking Lutherans; by Rev. Edward T. Horn, A. M. 2. The Origin of Royal Government in Israel; by Prof. Dr. G. H. Shoode. 3. Luther's Doctrine of Predestination and the Holy Scriptures. Translated from the German by Rev. G. F. Behringer. 4. The Stability of the Church; by Rev. John Brubaker, A. M. 5. Moral and Religious Education in Connection with Intellectual; by Rev. Professor J. W. Richard, A. M. 6. The Predestination Controversy; by Rev. Adam Martin, A. M. 7. The Supernatural Element of the Bible: Its Nature, Necessity, and Importance; by Rev. P. Rizer. 8. Baptism: Thoughts Suggested by the Ninth Article of the Augsburg Confession; by Rev. J. R. Dimm, A. M.

North American Review, April, 1881. (New York.)—1. Reform *versus* Reformation; by Judge Albion W. Tourgee. 2. The Thing that Might Be; by Mark Pattison. 3. Religion in Schools; by Bishop B. J. M'Quaid. 4. The Ownership of Railroad Property; by George Ticknor Curtis. 5. The Historic Genesis of Protestantism; by John Fiske. 6. The Telegraph Monopoly; by William M. Springer. 7. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow; by Anthony Trollope.

June.—1. Our Future Fiscal Policy; by Hugh M'Culloch. 2. The Patrician Element in American Society; by George B. Loring. 3. A New Phase of the Reform Movement; by Dorman B. Eaton. 4. Shall Americans Own Ships? by Prof. W. G. Sumner. 5. The Color Line; by Frederick Douglass. 6. The Ruins of Central America. Part VIII; by Désiré Charnay. 7. Vaccination; by Dr. Austin Flint. 8. The Right to Regulate Railway Charges; by J. M. Mason. 9. Prehistoric Man in America; by Prof. Edward S. Morse.

Presbyterian Review, April, 1881. (New York.)—1. Inspiration; by Prof. A. A. Hodge, D.D., and Prof. B. B. Warfield, D.D. 2. The Prevalent Confusion and the Attitude of Christian Faith; by Prof. Ransom B. Welch, D.D. 3. The Book of Discipline in a Revised Form, as Proposed by the Assembly's Revision Committee; by Rev. Edward P. Humphrey, D.D., LL.D., and Prof. Alex. T. M'Gill, D.D., LL.D. 4. Mormonism; by Rev. Robert G. M'Niece. 5. Charles Hodge; by Prof. F. L. Patton, D.D., LL.D.

Princeton Review, March, 1881. (New York.)—1. Evolution in Relation to Materialism; by Joseph Le Conte, LL.D. 2. A Moral Argument; by John P. Coyle. 3. The Historical Proofs of Christianity; by George P. Fisher, D.D., LL.D. 4. The Study of Anglo-Saxon; by Prof. Theodore W. Hunt. 5. The Argument Against Protective Taxes; by Prof. William C. Sumner. 6. The Reasonableness of Faith; by Principal Shairp, D.C.L.

May.—1. Practical Uses of Electricity; by Charles A. Young, Ph.D. 2. Christian Metempsyehosis; by Prof. Francis Bowen. 3. The Silver Question and the International Monetary Conference of 1881; by President Barnard, LL.D., L.H.D. 4. On Causation and Development; by President M'Cosh, D.D., LL.D. 5. The Sculptor and His Art; by John F. Weir, N.A. 6. The Regulation of Railroads; by Prof. Lyman H. Atwater, D.D., LL.D. 7. On the So-called Science of Religion; by William D. Whitney, Ph.D., LL.D.

Universalist Quarterly, April, 1881. (Boston.)—1. The Sin Against the Holy Ghost; by T. J. Sawyer, D.D. 2. Certain Phases of Our Growth; by Rev. G. M. Harmon. 3. Lessing's Theological Opinions; by Orello Cone, D.D. 4. The Power and Progress of Universalism; by Rev. Henry Blanchard. 5. Mrs. Judith Murray; by Rev. Richard Eddy. 6. New Testament Synonyms; by Nehemiah White, Ph.D. 7. A Restatement of the Temperance Problem; by Rev. E. A. Perry.

Quarterly Review of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, April, 1881. (Nashville, Tenn.)—1. The Bar: Its Ethics and Characteristics. 2. Janet on Final Causes. 3. The Drama. 4. God in History. 5. Miracles. 6. The Revised New Testament. 7. The Wesleys of the Nineteenth Century. 8. The Catacombs of Rome.

New Englander, March, 1881. (New Haven.)—1. Historical and Personal Reminiscences of the Spanish Revolution; by Prof. William I. Knapp. 2. The Personality of God; translated by W. Haskell, Ph.D. 3. Miss Bird's Japan and Yezo; by Prof. S. W. Williams. 4. Ireland as it is; by Prof. William M. Barbour. 5. The Life of Dr. Charles Hodge; by Prof. Timothy Dwight. 6. Preaching to the Boys and Girls; by Rev. James G. Merrill. 7. The Evangelical Hymnal; by Rev. Edward W. Gilman, D.D.

May, 1881.—1. Pre-adamites; by Rev. Joseph D. Wilson. 2. Shakespeare in the Opinion of the Seventeenth Century; by B. C. Burt. 3. The Jewish Question in Europe; by Prof. S. H. Kellogg, D.D. 4. The Sunday-school Library; by Rev. O. A. Kingsbury. 5. The Wines of the Bible; by Rev. T. Laurie, D.D. 6. A Lesson for England: an American Anti-rent Excitement, and How it was Quelled; by Oliver E. Lyman, Esq. 7. Thomas Carlyle; by Rev. William M. Barbour.

The Article on Pre-adamites, by Mr. Wilson, is an admirable discussion of an important subject, introducing some new and valuable points. It answers Dr. Winchell's book with great success, but with entire courtesy. It takes up the argument as based in archæology, ethnology, linguistics, Egyptology, and Scripture, and deals with it concisely but effectively.

In regard to Professor Whitney's Calaveras' skull, the sole fossil piece of humanity upon which Dr. W. founds an argu-

ment, Mr. Wilson, (in addition to Mr. Southall's discussion of that specimen in our last Quarterly,) furnishes the following statements:

This "find" is a human skull taken from a shaft near Angelos, one hundred and fifty feet deep in the gold-bearing gravel; the shaft pierces five beds of lava and other volcanic matter. Professor Whitney, who obtained this skull for the museum of California, has no doubt of its great antiquity. As late as 1878, in a lecture delivered at Cambridge, Massachusetts, he re-affirmed his conviction that it belonged to the Pliocene epoch. At the time it came into Whitney's hands it was still embedded in its gravelly matrix. "In the skull and about it were found other human bones, including some that must have belonged to an infant. The skull was not inferior to those of existing races. Its organic matter was almost entirely lost, and the phosphate of lime was replaced by carbonate of lime."

Several circumstances raise a suspicion of the extreme age of this skull. The gravel in which it is found is a surface deposit "covering the face of the country" in some regions, and therefore a man of the present day might leave his skull in it. "But it was found under one hundred and fifty feet of lava." True. And how long a period would it take a volcano to deposit that amount of lava? Within the present century volcanoes have deposited as much as six hundred feet of lava in a single eruption. The important question is not, How thick is the lava, but how long has it been *in situ?* The United States geological survey of the Territories, 1871, 1872, declares that "the effusion of the basal is a modern event, occurring for the most part near the commencement of our present period, after the entire surface reached nearly, or quite, the present elevation." Volcanoes still exist in the Pacific region, and from recent signs at Pike's Peak and elsewhere it is not improbable that this generation may witness eruptions in many old craters whose fires have been supposed extinct. Earthquakes are not uncommon in California, and the hot springs, which are numerous, are looked upon by geologists as "the last of a series of volcanic events." So that the thickness of the lava above the Calaveras skull shows nothing but that the bones were deposited before any white man visited those regions. As for the "gravelly matrix," any bones deposited in the gravel where the warm waters of a geyser may percolate to them, will become incrusted with a "gravelly matrix." All along the Illinois River bones, brickbats, and even bits of wood may be found cemented to the river pebbles by carbonate of lime.

The absence of gelatinous matter in bones is a criterion of age only when all the chemical circumstances are known. The Pacific slope has been, until very recently, the scene of violent volcanic action. The geysers and hot springs, still numerous in

that region, are but the dying embers of fierce chemical action. Were those Calaveras bones subjected to the chemical action of geysers? Were they immersed in the boiling water of hot springs? Were they calcined by the molten lava flowing over the gravel in which they rested? If "yes" is answered to any of these questions, then the animal matter may have been extracted as quickly as in a modern kitchen or glue factory.

These considerations show on how slender evidence the antiquity of the Calaveras man is hung, and when there is added the confession of the miner, one Brier, who took the skull out of a cave and placed it in the shaft for the purpose of hoaxing a geologist, it must be admitted that this last survivor of the vast army of Pre-adamic remains may as well be gathered unto his fathers.—Pp. 283–285.

Mr. Wilson gives a fresh revision of the geology of the Nile delta, which, if tenable, seems to expunge very conclusively the tall chronologies of the Egyptologists. That delta is composed simply of the sediment brought down by the Nile from Northern Egypt, poured into the Mediterranean so as to form made land far into the sea. The amount of that sediment, vast as it is, is capable of a very fair scientific measurement. The rate of the accumulation of the sediment can also be approximately estimated. We can tell, then, how old Egyptian soil is. Lanoye, in his "Rameses the Great," as noticed in a former number of our Quarterly, gives 4,500 years B. C. as the period at whose commencement Egypt began to be inhabitable. Our present reviewer, under the light of the examinations made by the French and English naval officers preparatory to the constructing the Suez Canal, elaborately ciphers out a new result. His conclusion is that "prior to 2320 B. C., therefore, there was no delta, and, of course, there were no inhabitants in Lower Egypt. The Mississippi River began building its delta at the same time. There is good reason to believe that the Danube began forming land at the same time, and doubtless the same geological convulsion accounts for the present location of all these rivers."—Pp. 300, 301.

If the following statement, drawn from Herodotus, is sustainable, it is very important:

> A study of his [Herodotus'] journey to Memphis makes it plain that the coast of the delta was thirty-three miles south of its present position. A line drawn thirty-three miles inland from the present coast divides the alluvial land nearly in the middle.

About as much land has been formed since Herodotus' time as was formed before. He visited Egypt 440 B. C., a little earlier than half way back to 4,200 years ago.—P. 301.

These views, if established, would produce a fearful crash of the stately structures reared by Manetho and his modern followers. And the reviewer well adds:

If these calculations are correct, it is evident that a reconstruction of the already much-revised system of Egyptian chronology will be necessary. The most recent and most moderate estimates of the Memphite dynasties places their rise at 2400 B. C. But at that time the site of Memphis was under water, and for many years after the whole narrow valley of the Nile, as far south as Thebes, was a swamp, just as Herodotus says it was. The suspicion begins to dawn that perhaps Prof. Seyffath is right when he tells us that our interpretations of the hieroglyphics has been a blunder from the first. Egypt is ancient, but Egypt is not older than the deluge.—P. 301.

The article closes with the following very suggestive paragraph:

In concluding this paper we draw attention to the calculations of Faà de Bruns, professor at Turin, (*Les Mondes*, 1863,) on the rate of increase in the human family. As is well known, France is the only country possessing accurate statistics of population extending back two hundred years. During that time France has suffered from devastating wars, from famine, and from epidemic disease. Neither immigration nor emigration has greatly disturbed the normal rate of increase. Fortunately, therefore, the only available statistics are of the country which is more nearly a microcosm than any other. Taking, then, the average annual increment in France, and applying it to the whole human race, it will be found that six persons will increase to 1,400,000,000 persons in 4,211 years. 1,400,000,000 persons was the estimated population of the world in 1863, and 4,211 years before A. D. 1863 brings us to 2348 B. C., the common date of the flood.—P. 303.

The article on the Jewish Question in Europe unfolds a curious state of affairs. A general alarm is felt through Teutonic Europe, extending even into Sclavonic Russia, at the growing intellectual ascendency of the Jewish race. The Jews are becoming masters in finance, in education, in politics, and even in religion. They rule over the bourse, and are the bankers of Europe. They fill, out of proportion to their number in the State, the universities. They outstrip the Gentiles

in authorship. They rule in popular journalism, and are thereby the promoters of democracy, communism, nihilism, and anarchy. They are becoming the industrial upper stratum, crowding the Teutons into a menial rank. Thus it is said, "All the lower forms of labor, in the workshops, the fields, the ditches, and the swamps, fall to the lot of the German element, while the constantly increasing Jewish element obtains enormous possessions in capital and land, and raises itself to power and influence in every department of public life."—P. 335. Their professional predominance is thus illustrated: "At the post-mortem examination of a body lately there were present the district physician, the lawyer, the surgeon, and a fourth official, all Jews, and none but the corpse was a German."—P. 340. How they thrive and rule by the liquor trade is thus described:

> More than a sixth part of the Jews in Russia live by means of the liquor trade, as is admitted by the Jews themselves. The same is true of the Jews in Roumania and all the Slavic lands. . . . With the liquor trade usury goes hand in hand. "As the result," we are told, "it is a fact which can no longer be denied that the population of the remote districts of Russia, Austria, Hungary, and Roumania, are only the nominal possessors of the soil, and for the most part quite strictly cultivate the land only for the Jews, to whom they have mortgaged their lands for their liquor debts."—Pp. 335, 336.

There is an equal alarm in the ranks of Christianity. The Jews, being masters of European journalism, employ that instrumentality with great effect in assailing Christianity in the most opprobrious style, and diffusing rationalism and open infidelity among the masses. To this is due, to a large extent, the dechristianization and demoralization of the times.

For all this alarm there seems ample proof that there is just ground. But to remedy the evil by proscriptive laws and the imposition of legal disabilities and disfranchisements is an obsolete method. Fair play is a priceless jewel. The proscriptive method is too much like the despotism of our American slave-holders, who prohibited negro education, and then made the negro's intellectual degradation a ground of enslaving him. Nor will it be a feasible plan to undertake to

trepan the Shemite in order to take out his surplus of brains. If the Jew can beat the Gentile he is entitled to the premium. Right it is to make public exposition of his growing ascendency and reveal the great danger of his success. But the true and final method for Japheth is to rouse to a higher level his energy and beat them in the contest. The late Rev. Phineas Rice, a member once of our New York Conference, sometimes said things that were witty and wise. Bishop Hedding said to him in open Conference, "What have you to say, Brother Rice, to this charge?" "What is the charge, sir?" "They say," pursued the Bishop, "that you preach over the people's heads." "Then let them elevate their heads, sir," responded Phineas. And so when we are told that the Teutons find the Jews mounting over their heads, we respond, "Let them elevate their heads then."

But it seems a singular problem that no such Shemite ascendency prevails on this side of the Atlantic. We count rarely a Jew among our millionaires, statesmen, scholars, journalists, or other eminent ranks. Subjected to no disabilities, he attains no popularity or ascendency here. Is this because the American Jew is inferior, or because the American Teuton is superior, to the European? Modesty forbids our affirming the latter, tenderness to the humble forbids the former. We leave the query unanswered.

It needs no Shemites to render our American journalism irreligious or unchristian. Gentile semi-infidelity amply does the deadly work in our leading metropolitan periodicals. Our daily presses pour cataracts of sarcastic skepticism into the bosom of our families. It is a wonder that, in spite of the reckless ribaldry spread before the eyes of our children, there remains with them so much Christian faith. The Christian preacher comes but once a week; the newspaper theologian comes perhaps seven days a week; and it is a wonder he does not undo all the pulpit does. Of the Christian preacher the world requires, justly, holiness of life. Otherwise his gospel is pronounced false. But the newspaper theologian may be as loose in life as in creed, and his reckless rant goes for sweeping truth. It diminishes nothing of the force of a newspaper pronunciamento on the highest points of eternal interests that the writer is a rowdy.

Bibliotheca Sacra, April, 1881. (Andover.)—1. The Serpent Tempter in Oriental Mythology; by Rev. William Hayes Ward, D.D. 2. Two Isaiahs, or One; by Rev. William Henry Cobb. 3. The Sabbath: Did the Early Fathers Hold that the Fourth Commandment is Abolished? by Rev. William De Loss Love, D.D. 4. The Nature and Object of Penalty; by Rev. William W. Patton, D.D. 5. The Fundamental Laws of Belief; by Rev. Charles F. Thwing. 6. The Syntax of עֵרֶט; by the late Rev. Robert Hutcheson. 7. Note on Acts xi, 26; by Rev. Frederic Gardiner, D.D. 8. Does the Preface to Luke's Gospel Belong also to the Acts? by Prof. Lemuel S. Potwin. 9. Remarks of Jonathan Edwards on the Trinity; by Edwards A. Park. 10. Theological Education.

In the first article Dr. Ward furnishes an interesting discussion of the relations of ancient serpent symbols to the Mosaic history of the temptation, especially as revealed by the late discoveries in archæology.

That archæology seems to disclose two forms of animal being somewhat related, the Griffin or Dragon and the Serpent. Lenormant recognizes only the former, which he asserts symbolizes chaos, and denies the appearance in archæology of the latter, and so any indication of the temptation. Lenormant's view is: "The Chaldean mythologers called the power of disorder and evil Tihamti, or Tiamat, the Deep, who was not a serpent at all, but a griffin, with the jaws of a lion and the talons of an eagle; and with them the attack of Bel-Merodach upon the Dragon was not so much in punishment for the temptation of man as it was to represent the warfare of light and order upon darkness and chaos."—P. 209. Dr. Ward brings us proofs that additional to the chaotic griffin there are to be found traces of the Edenic serpent.

This duality is very interesting. The battle between Bel-Merodach and the Griffin we would say symbolizes Gen. i, 2. "The earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep," and that is the terrible griffin; "and the Spirit of God moved upon the waters," and that is Lord Merodach subduing the monster. With our Moses, however, as a monotheist there is no *battle* between Elohim and Chaos. Rather it is Elohim *brooding* over the abyss, generating order from confusion. Second, as the griffin form symbolizes the work of *creation*, the serpent form symbolizes Gen. iii, 1–15, *fall and redemption*. The first is the work of Elohim, the second of Jehovah-Elohim. It is the true archæological existence of the latter that Dr. Ward maintains. He thus indicates at once his view of the source whence reliable

information can be obtained, and the real agency by which the cosmogonic narrative was brought into Hebrew possession:

It is to Chaldea, and Chaldea only, that the Bible itself seems to direct us for light on this subject. Genesis begins with Shinar, as it ends with Egypt. Abraham comes from Ur of the Chaldees, and must be thought of as bringing with him the lore of Chaldea. The two rivers that we can recognize which surrounded Eden are the two between which lies Mesopotamia. The first event recorded after the Flood is the destruction of the Tower of Babel. The four kings who fought against five in the Vale of Siddim came from beyond the Euphrates. It was Bel-Merodach, Bin, Sin, Hea, and Ishtar, the gods of the Babylonians, that were the gods of Terah and Nahor, "the gods whom your fathers served beyond the flood," to whom Joshua bade the people return if they would not serve the Lord. The remarkable discovery by George Smith a few years ago, of a Babylonian story of the Deluge, very like that told in Genesis, gives us reason to believe that other parts of the earliest Mosaic history of the world were as familiar to the Chaldeans as to the Jews. Jewish and Christian writers had preserved an account of the Deluge said to have been written from national records by the Babylonian priest, Berosus; but it was easy to assert and difficult to disprove that it was merely the Hebrew story carried to Babylon at the Captivity. But we now possess the very tablets, laid away nearly a hundred years before the Captivity in the royal library, and which are indorsed as copied from others a thousand years older still, written in the Assyrian cuneiform characters, on which is recorded the complete story of the Ark, the destruction of men and beasts, the deliverance of Xisuthrus, the sending out of the birds, the resting of the Ark on a high mountain, the sacrifice, and the divine promise. There is considerable reason to believe that the old Chaldeans also possessed legends of the creation of the world and of the confusion of tongues, corresponding more or less with the accounts given in Genesis. We might, then, look, with some reasonable expectation of finding it, for a legend of the temptation of our first parents by the serpent which will illustrate the Mosaic story.—Pp. 215, 216.

Does not our author assert too strongly the *exclusiveness* of the Chaldean source? Dr. Geikie, in his "Hours with the Bible," elsewhere noticed, adduces from Wilkinson an Egyptian figure of a serpent's head being pierced by a goddess, and an Indian Krishna treading on a serpent's head.

Dr. Ward furnishes three leading Assyrian engravings in which the Edenic serpent *may* be recognized. The first presents a tree with two human figures plucking the fruit, with a serpent

in the rear. That we consider a clear case, and is confirmed by the Egyptian figure above mentioned. Of the other two engravings given we are not so fully convinced. The one is a long wavy figure, which may be merely an elongation of the griffin, rising into apparently a griffin's head, and representing by its impressive undulations, perhaps the chaotic *abyss*. We should then have the symbolization of Gen. i, 2, with which, however, the struggle of redemption with moral disorder may be blended, confusing the two great battles into one. The third figure is clearly griffin and not serpent, and is not a strong confirmation. A significant point is made by our author, namely, that the serpent is a malignant being among the Semitic and Aryan peoples only, but is a good deity among the Turanians.

Dr. Ward, with most scholars, derives the Tiamat or personification of chaos in the Assyrian archæology from the Tehôm "waters" or *abyss* of Gen. i, 2. It would seem then that a term, lying in the bed of the Hebrew language and the Hebrew narrative, is taken by polytheism and formed into a symbolical name of a symbolical figure representing the chaos. Does not this suggest that the polytheistic name is a derivation from the Mosaic, and that the Mosaic is the primitive document? We mean not that the document is truly original with Moses; but provisionally supposable to be derived through Abraham from the antediluvian monotheistic Church, through perhaps the patriarch Shem. It may then be a translation from an earlier language, of which the Hebrew and Arabic are twin daughters. And the poetic rhythm and style of the Chaldean records, as well as that of the first chapter of Genesis, strongly confirm the theory that that wonderful composition is truly an antediluvian PSALM OF THE CREATION.

Dr. Ward thus concludes with a careful recognition that our Ophiology is as yet very much in a provisional state, waiting for further disclosures to decide how fully it confirms the historic character of the Mosaic narrative of the Fall:

> I hesitate to claim for these Chaldean myths that they do any thing more than illustrate the Bible account. There is too much yet uncertain to allow us to claim that they confirm it. The form of these myths is not so self-evidencing as to allow us to settle off-hand that they represent nothing more than mere myths, either like the Vedic, which sees a serpent in the storm-

cloud, or like the Mazdean, which, occupied with great moral problems, and no longer with the phenomena of the sky, looks at evil and disorder under the form of a serpent hostile to Ahuramazda. Their form is not really inconsistent with the faith of those who prefer to regard them as the perversion through tradition of a great historical fact at the beginning of the history of the human race. We need a clearer notion of the myths of the various great families. We need to understand what is the ethnic relation of Turanian to the Hamitic races. We need also to be able to answer more certainly the question whether, as would seem from the language in which these myths appear, they have a Turanian origin, or whether they can belong to the extremely early Shemitic eruption over Mesopotamia from the Persian Gulf. This, however, it seems to me, must be recognized as a fact, that there had been somehow developed, and had become perfectly familiar in Mesopotamia, at a period centuries anterior to the time of Moses, as far back as the age ascribed to Abraham, stories perfectly parallel to those of Moses, which in form are purely mythical; and that, therefore, the burden of proof will rest upon those who regard the Mosaic stories as historical to prove that the earlier Chaldean stories had an origin different from other myths. This they will not be slow to attempt; and Dr. Tyler Lewis, in an able discussion on the Chaldean Deluge, which ought to be rescued from the columns of the New York "Times," in which it is now lost, has indicated what would be the direction of the argument.—Pp. 229, 230.

English Reviews.

British Quarterly Review, April, 1881. (London.)—1. Congregationalism. 2. Our Salmon Fisheries. 3. The Masora. 4. Mr. Hardy's Novels. 5. Schliemann's Ilios. 6. The Bane of English Architecture. 7. The Irish Land Question. 8. Independency and the State.

London Quarterly Review, April. (London.)—1. South African Confederation. 2. The Father of Penny Postage. 3. Sacred Music. 4. Kant's Philosophy of Experience. 5. Are the Chinese a Religious People? 6. St. John Chrysostom. 7. Ruskin's Letters to the Clergy. 8. The Latest Commentaries on St. John's Gospel. 9. Mr. Carlyle.

Westminster Review, April, 1881. (New York.)—1. Kant's Moral Philosophy. 2. Lord Campbell's Memoirs. 3. The Origin of Religion. 4. The Persian Empire. 5. Electoral Reform, Electoral Bribery: The Ballot. 6. Thomas Carlyle: His Life and Writings. 7. Should University Degrees be Given to Women?

London Quarterly Review, April, 1881. (New York.)—1. The Revolutionary Party. 2. Literary Life of Lord Bolingbroke. 3. The Speaker's Commentary on the New Testament. 4. Thomas Carlyle and his Reminiscences. 5. Russian Land Laws and Present Proprietors. 6. Sir Anthony Panizzi. 7. Endowments of the Church of England in 1830 and 1880. 8. Ministerial Embarrassments.

The English reviews indicate that in the highest literature of England no very profound homage is paid to Carlyle.

Both the Edinburgh and London Quarterlies have rigidly critical articles on his intellectual character and his literary value.

The following passage was received after the writing of our book-notice, on another page, and it shows that our view, though subjectively original, has been anticipated elsewhere:

> Carlyle's popularity is mainly owing to his eccentricities, and an eminent French critic, M. Scherer, maintains that they are the result of calculation. "The author delights in odd, rude, uncouth phrases, odd exclamations, interrogations, apostrophes to actors on the scene, to the reader, to heaven, to all things. Nothing can exceed the abuse he makes of the words of God, Infinite, Eternity, Profundity. It is true that he gives them an air of youth by putting them in the plural; he says the Immensities, the Silences, the Eternal Veracities, etc., etc. It is needless to say, this mixed part of prophet and buffoon, these labored eccentricities produce less the effect of a conviction or a nature than of the desire to attract attention."
>
> M. Scherer justifies this view by the cold reception of the "Life of Schiller," which was written in ordinary English, and he shows that the change began with "Sartor Resartus," which first brought Carlyle prominently into notice. "Thenceforth, at all events, the writer takes to a manner which has the double advantage of being easier than the purely simple one, and of piquing the curiosity of the public. 'Our own impression is that he slipped or 'drifted' into this manner imperceptibly, led on, no doubt, by the growing demand for what he would call the 'shoddy' article and the injudicious praises of friends. His admirers, especially his lady admirers, have a great deal to answer for. Bearing in mind that his world was a little world, a microcosm, we might apply to him what was said of Voltaire, "Enfant gâté d'un monde qu'il gâte." The deification of force is not a manly doctrine. It commends itself more to women than to men. It is conscious weakness clinging instinctively to strength.—P. 208, 209.

The following passage narrates Carlyle's onset upon one of his devoted admirers in America:

> Emerson, the celebrated American, was well-known as an abolitionist. When he came to England, Mrs. Procter took him, at his own request, to see Carlyle, who immediately introduced the subject of slavery and said: "God has put into every white man's hand a whip to flog the black." Emerson made no reply.—P. 207.

The following passage indicates the value put upon the accuracy of Carlyle's recollections of the opinions attributed by

him to his intimates in regard to other eminent characters. It confirms our doubt of his recollection of the words of Edward Irving expressed in our book notice.

Wilberforce fares quite as badly, if not worse, for Wordsworth is introduced as adopting and expressing the opinion Carlyle had formed concerning him: "One of the best-remembered sketches (almost the only one now remembered at all) was that of Wilberforce, the famous Nigger philanthropist, drawing-room Christian, and busy man and politician. In all which capacities Wordsworth's esteem of him seemed to be privately as small as my own private one, and was amusing to gather. No hard word of him did he speak or hint; told in brief firm business terms, how he was born at or near the place called Wilberforce, in Yorkshire, ("force," signifying torrent or angry brook, as in Cumberland?) where, probably, his forefathers may have been possessors, *though he was poorish;* how he did this and that of insignificant (to Wordsworth insignificant) nature; "and then," ended Wordsworth, "he took into the oil trade," (I suppose the Hull whaling,) which lively phrase, and the incomparable historical tone it was given in—"the oil trade"—as a thing perfectly natural and proper for such a man, *is almost the only point in the delineation which is now vividly present to me.* I remember only the rustic picture, sketched as with a burnt stick on the board of a pair of bellows, seemed to be completely good; and that the general effect was, one saw the great Wilberforce and his existence visible in all their main lineaments, but only as through the reversed telescope, and reduced to size of a mouse and its nest, or little more!"

If Wordsworth neither spoke nor hinted a hard word, his sketch of Wilberforce has evidently been distorted by Carlyle's habitual cast of mind into a studied depreciation. It is incredible that Wordsworth could have spoken of Wilberforce (who inherited a considerable fortune, was educated at Cambridge, and entered Parliament soon after he came of age) as poorish, or as having taken to the oil trade; and the intensely low-bred, low-minded allusion to it may pair off with Howard's "disgust at the grocer business."—P. 207.

Edinburgh Review, April, 1881. (New York.)—1. The Oxford School. 2. Egypt Bound and Unbound. 3. The Song of Roland. 4. The Public Life of Mr. Herries. 5. River Floods. 6. The Pellagra in Italy. 7. Reminiscences of Thomas Carlyle. 8. Darwin on the Movements of Plants. 9. Schliemann's Ilios. 10. Local Debts and Government Loans.

The Edinburgh article on Carlyle is superior in style to the London, but not less severe. It opens with the following generous, though qualified, and, on the whole, just tribute to the best qualities of Carlyle's earlier writings:

Carlyle's contributions to the "Edinburgh Review," the article on "Burns," the article entitled "Signs of the Times," and the article entitled "Characteristics," are not inferior to any of his later works, and may be said to contain the pith and marrow of them all, without the blemishes of a corrupt style and the paradoxes of an unsettled faith. It is, and will ever remain, the honor and glory of Thomas Carlyle that he contended without ceasing for what he termed the *dynamical* energy of the human soul in opposition to the tendencies of a *mechanical* age. His whole work was an indignant protest against the materialism of modern science, and an assertion of the spiritual dignity and duty of man. He poured forth a torrent of scorn and invective against the vulgar passions and motives which degrade society; he poured forth in a perpetual anthem his veneration for the higher powers to which he attached all that is noble, heroic, dutiful, and true in human life. The mode of thought, expressed in highly rhetorical and eccentric language, and enhanced by a strong northern dialect, a rugged aspect, and blunt manners, gave him the demeanor of a mystic, or, as some said, of a prophet. His influence over the younger generations of this century became considerable; his works which had not found much acceptance when first written, became popular; and his authority has extended beyond the circulation of his writings. Doubtless, then, he proclaimed, or was supposed to proclaim, either some new truth to the world, or some old truth in a new and striking form.—P. 239.

The following shows Carlyle after that memorable year of his "conversion" given in our book-notice:

Mr. Carlyle was at war with all the tendencies of his own age, and all the social elements that surrounded him—the best as well as the worst. The spirit of inquiry and investigation was to him but another name for a disease of the human mind. What are "the Improvement of the Age, the Spirit of the Age, Destruction of Prejudice, Progress of the Species, and the March of Intellect, but an unhealthy state of self-sentience, self-survey; the precursor and prognostic of still worse health?" All heroism, he said, departed from this country, if not from this earth, with the last of the Puritans in the seventeenth century. The whole life of society is carried on by drugs. All our institutions are shams. Parliamentary government is the worst of shams. The idea of government by the voice and will of numbers is a preposterous delusion. What is called "the people" is a multitude of fools. The only real ruler of men is the tyrant who has strength or cunning to grasp and retain supreme power. Slavery is a natural institution, since it is based on the evident superiority of the white race over the black. Force not only governs the world, but it absorbs and extinguishes the rights of those who presume to resist it. All these propositions

may be found in Mr. Carlyle's writings, or may fairly be deduced from them. They might serve as an apology for the most execrable forms of oppressions. They are absolutely opposed to the spirit of freedom, to the active sympathies of humanity, and to the respect due to the independent opinions of the humble and weak. It has ever been to us a matter of surprise that a writer whose works are distinguished by principles more cynical than Mandeville, and more tyrannical than Hobbes, should be regarded with enthusiastic admiration by numbers of persons who profess advanced liberal opinions in this country, and even in the United States. The net result of Mr. Carlyle's political opinions would seem to be that a government of Bismarcks or Gambettas is the perfection of statesmanship.—P. 241.

The following illustrates the absolute want of consistency in his so-called opinions:

With strange inconsistency he will exclaim at one moment: "Truly it may be said that divinity has withdrawn from the earth, or veils himself in that wide-wasting whirlwind of a departing era, wherein the fewest can discern his goings. Not Godhood, but an iron ignoble circle of necessity embraces all things; binds the youth of these times into a sluggish thrall, or else exasperates him into a rebel. Heroic action is paralyzed, for what worth now remains unquestionable with him?"

And then, ten pages further on in the same essay: "Truly every-where the eternal fact begins again to be recognized that there is a godlike in human affairs; that God not only made us and beholds us, but is in us and around us; that the age of miracles, as it ever was, now is. . . . He that has an eye and a heart can even now say, 'Why should I falter? Light has come into the world; to such as love light, so as light must be loved, with a boundless, all-doing, all enduring love.'" And the passage concludes with a magnificent exhortation to conquer and create uncreated and unconquered continents and Eldorados, since from the bosom of eternity shine for us celestial guiding stars.

Each of these paragraphs bears the stamp of Carlyle's fervid eloquence; but placed side by side they openly contradict each other, and neither of them is rational or exactly true.—P. 243.

The Eighth Article brings to view the results of the *studies in the growth of plants* by that wonderful observer of nature, Charles Darwin.

The Reviewer agrees with Mr. Darwin as to the real action of plants in growing, but decisively differs with him in his surreptitious attempt at obliterating the distinction between plant action and animal action. Mr. Darwin insinuates analo-

gies tending to identify plant life with animal intelligence. The Reviewer first states the true nature of plant movement, showing that it is all mechanical; being, in fact, caused by the incoming of new force and substance in the process of growth. Plants, Mr. Darwin shows, "circumnutate," that is, nod about, and with the tip of their radicle adapt themselves to conditions of warmth, light, and softness of adjacent substance. The Review replies:

But animals do not circumnutate. Their movements are of a strikingly different character from the nodding and staggering gyration which is here pointed to as the primary process in the plant. The stems, roots, and leaves are thrust out in consequence of the interstitial deposit of new material in the growing textures, and the extending shoots assume a spiral form of advance because the thrust is exerted more on one side than on the other. The onward projection is thus essentially a process of growth from the addition of substance, and all the irregularities in the halting progress are immediately ascribed to a purely physical cause, the swelling or increased turgidity of the tissue at the point where the sidelong thrust occurs. The only circumstance that at all warrants the assumption of a resemblance in the strongly contrasted processes is the fact, which Dr. Darwin has brought prominently into notice, that the mechanical impulse of the disturbing influence originates not at the spot upon which the effect of that impact is transmitted by an intermediate agency seated in the organization of the plant. He is obviously aware that this is the strong point of the argument for resemblance which he suggests, as in one notable paragraph he says, "But the most striking resemblance is the localization of sensitiveness, and the transmission of an influence from the excited part to another, which consequently moves." The effect here alluded to is, no doubt, very remarkable, and well deserving of the further examination which it will assuredly receive at the hands of physiologists. But it can hardly be conceived to be strong enough to support any comprehensive hypothesis of the identity of vegetable and animal movements. Dr. Darwin himself says, "Plants do not, of course, possess nerves or a central nervous system." But he then deprecatingly and somewhat significantly adds, "And we may infer that with animals such structures serve only for the more perfect transmission of impressions, and for the more complete inter-communication of the several parts."—Pp. 258, 259.

The line between intelligence and volitional action in the animal, on one side, and the merely mechanical action under growth forces in the plant, is drawn by the Reviewer at length

and with great clearness and beauty. For this purpose he selects the lowest known form of animal life, the *Amœba*.

The creature is found most commonly in the slime which collects upon submerged or floating objects. It is apparently destitute even of a skin, and it has no internal organ of any kind. It is simply a small mass of animated jelly, possessing the power of streaming half coherently about under some mysterious and apparently spontaneously exerted impulse. When first placed upon the glass slide of a microscope, it presents the aspect of a small, round, transparent mass; but finger-like processes soon begin to be pushed out from the pulp in various directions, somewhat after the manner of the horns of a snail. Some one of these having at last fixed itself to the glass, the rest of the mobile jelly rolls over the attached part, and then begins to push out other processes. The amœba, in reality, travels along the glass in this grotesque shambling way. By the mere flow of its half-coherent living substance, it not only changes its form, but shifts its position. If, during its Protean shambling progress, it comes in contact with any fragmentary morsel suitable to be turned to account as food, it spreads itself over the fragment until it envelops it within its own substance, and in that way extemporizes a digestive cavity or stomach, where the morsel soon gets dissolved and converted into living protoplasm. Indigestible matters, which cannot be so turned to account, are dismissed by a reversal of the process; the fluent jelly loosening its grasp, rolling itself off, and so leaving them behind as it moves away in some other direction.

This microscopic changeling of Ehrenberg is an object of the very deepest interest to physiologists, because it is a typical specimen of the raw material of animal life presented to observation in its simplest and least-disguised form. Although a mere lump of animated jelly, without any trace of specialized organization, it yet manages to perform several of the most important operations of animal life, accomplishing, in its organless state, results which, in the more highly endowed animals, are performed only through the instrumentality of an elaborately complex and diversified apparatus. It extemporizes, in the rudest, but nevertheless most effective way, actions which are essential to its lowly form of existence. Its fluent pulp serves it in the place of limbs. It turns its own flesh into a stomach, and secretes a digesting juice round its entangled prey. It assimilates and appropriates food, and turns it into mobile living substance like itself. It consumes its own pulp by the wasting efforts of its movements. It reproduces living lumps like itself by breaking up into fragments, and above all *it breathes*, not through the specialized appendage of lungs, but throughout its entire gelatinous mass. The air permeates its naked or skinless pulp, and oxygen is appropriated and carbonic acid generated and expelled. It is oxidized, or burned, so to speak, and its

powers of shambling movement, of digesting food, of elaborating secretions, and of performing other allied operations, are as essentially a result of that combustive oxidation as the flame of a candle is the result of the burning of its stearine or wax. This process of oxidation, or faculty of breathing, indeed, constitutes its claim to the distinction of being "animated." The word simply implies that it possesses *anima*, or breath. This, then, is radically the difference to which it is our purpose to draw attention. Plants move because they grow. The circumnutation which Dr. Darwin discovers at the bottom of the movements of the plant, is an effect of growth. It is due to the elaboration and building up. Wherever it is manifesting itself, carbon is in process of being fixed, and oxygen in the process of emancipation and discharge. But the animal protoplasm—the basement of animated flesh—moves because it is in process of combustive destruction, which is the exact opposite of elaborating construction. Heat is appropriated in the case of the vegetable movement, and rendered latent as one of the constituents of the accumulating structure, and as an implement of cohesion. The sunshine is actually put to the work of holding together the constituent elements of the molecules of the enlarging mass. Heat is set free, in the case of the animal movement, as a supply of energy or power capable of doing work, and in the breathing animal, as a result of the dissolution and destruction of the cohesive integrity of previously built-up molecules.—Pp. 259, 260.

Art. IX.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

THE CONVENT SCHOOLS IN BELGIUM.

Some astonishing disclosures have just been made in Oudenarde, regarding the utter depravity of both teachers and pupils in the school of a convent bearing the dubious title of "Good Works." (*Bonnes Œuvres.*) For some time the attention of the correctional police has been called to the rumors regarding those having the establishment in charge, which has been a rival of the secular schools of the government. An investigation proved the guilt of about thirty teachers of complicity in indecent outrages on the girls, and of violence and cruelty in their general treatment. The revelations made on the witness-stand were simply frightful; not isolated acts, but a studied and systematic practice of the basest crimes committed in a large educational establishment, and one of the first schools of Belgium; teachers and pupils seemed alike to indulge in the most obscene orgies—depravity reduced to a veritable system. This Convent of "Good Works" (*sic!*) is the mother-house of the order, and here the young novices go through their training; and the "*Flandre Liberale*" is our authority for saying that this "congregation" has ex-

tended its propaganda not only throughout Belgium, where it has eleven houses, but also in Holland, where it has six, and even in America.

These disclosures have set the authorities at work against other "congregations" of like stamp which they have discovered. Public indignation is intense throughout Belgium, and in Ghent the Bishop was compelled to close the boarding establishments, and only take day scholars, who would be there simply in study hours. The diocesan authority must have known of much of this abuse, for a clerical journal confesses that the difficulty is not of yesterday, and that a more prompt solution of it would have prevented much trouble. The Bishop helped as many as possible of the brothers to escape, and the most of them have crossed the frontier into Holland, where they find shelter in the affiliated establishments. In Belgium, as in France, the members of the religious orders nearly always succeed in avoiding punishment by retreating for awhile, and then returning under another Church name; and these are so much alike and so general that it is quite difficult to distinguish them, and detect their bearers as former criminals. This utter depravity of the convent system of popular schools, proved before a court of justice, must do much toward breaking up these pesthouses in the rural districts of Belgium, where they sow vice as weeds. And in view of these disclosures it is astounding that their supporters can have the brazen impudence still to oppose and embarrass the communal schools in all possible ways, under the plea that they are "Godless schools," in which the children learn nothing but vice and immorality.

THE GERMAN ULTRAMONTANES.

Under their indefatigable leader, Windhorst, the German Ultramontanes seem determined to annoy the government, and prevent rather than aid in restoring pastors to the parishes left unprovided for by the deposition of the recalcitrant bishops. After a recent tirade on the parliamentary floor on the part of Windhorst, the Minister of Public Worship brought out some significant figures to show that matters in Catholic Germany are by no means as bad as they are painted. The entire number of parishes in Prussia for 8,800,000 souls amount to 4,804; of these 1,103 were without regular pastors, with a population of 280,000. But even this gap has been largely filled by the compromise laws lately passed, and in some regions in active and successful operation, notwithstanding the opposition of the party of the Center, which seems to prefer discord and disintegration to harmony and affiliation. 445 parishes have been already supplied through the operation of these laws, with a population of 1,900,000. The parishes now reported as not being well or fully supplied number 150, with 170,000 souls. According to this showing there is therefore now but a small percentage of the parishes without religious privileges. With this view of the case the spirit of exaggeration in the Catholic party has done a good work in greatly magnifying their persecution. The Minister of Public Worship has again and again expressed an ardent desire to settle the troubles and arrive at a condition of peace; but with a persistent

opposition to the State authorities this is not easy. If the controlling Catholic circles could only see that such means will never lead to any thing profitable, and will certainly never coerce the State into any humiliating measures, they might be induced to cease bickering, and join in mending the fragments of churches and parishes now left as a wreck of the struggle. It is now understood that the Papal authorities are no longer in sympathy with those irreconcilables.

THE ANTI-SEMITIC PERSECUTIONS.

The fearful agitations against the Jews in Germany are now bearing their fruits in Russia and other semi-oriental lands in excessive personal violence, which cabinets and rulers will vainly try to quell. It seems to be manifest destiny that periodical outbreaks of violence against them shall have their course, notwithstanding all theories to the contrary. When the Jews are allowed the full exercise of their talents under liberal rule, the story of Joseph, the son of Jacob, who became privy-counselor to Pharaoh, and finally ruler of Egypt, finds its counterpart in Christian Europe, where many men of Jewish birth or origin have arrived at the premier's chair. The most noted one of these was Beaconsfield, a descendant of the Spanish Jews driven from their homes by the persecutions of the Inquisition; and, though generations removed from those fathers in Israel, the Jewish spirit is manifest in his statecraft and his pen. Other noted statesmen of Jewish origin or birth may be found scattered over the Continent. France had Fould, the renowned financial minister of Napoleon III., Cremieux, the liberal statesman, lately deceased, and Gambetta—for it is claimed that he is by origin an Italian Jew. In Prussia, the late Minister of Agriculture, Friedenthal, was of Jewish extraction, as is the present Minister of Justice, Dr. Friedberg. The two recently retired Austrian ministers, Unger and Glasser, were of the Jewish line, and the gap has been filled by Baron Haymerle, the new Austrian Chancellor of State, whose parents turned from the Jewish to the Christian faith. Haymerle began his career as a revolutionist, and in 1849 was condemned to death. The present Emperor pardoned him, and in a few years he entered the civil service, and rose so rapidly from post to post that last year he took the place of Andrassy. The Finance Minister of Baden is a Jew in faith. Thus Jewish genius is avenging itself for the humiliations of the past, and hoping, by the help of Providence, to win back all it has lost. And thus the Jews in every sphere of life are hoping, while their enemies are fearing.

Art. X.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

ILLUSTRATED BIBLE STORY.

There is a veritable *furore* in Germany in the line of Bible illustrations as a means of popular instruction, as is proved by the success of "*Römheld's Illustrirte Biblische Geschichte*," that has already passed through several editions, though recently published by Velhagen & Klasing, of Leipsic. The present generation is a difficult one to preach to. The church is well-nigh deserted, at least by the male portion of the community; and those who sit under the droppings of the Gospel are much inclined to criticise and argue. And the most simple and attractive homilies are not favorite reading in the modern family. The great success of this book is, therefore, a literary event, as it professes to be "the sacred Gospel, in sermons for all Sundays and sacred days of the year, narrated and explained to the people." The author is a plain country pastor of a little village; but he has learned to be concise, clear, and forcible in his narrative, and preaches the *Gospel* of the Saviour rather than *about* the Gospel. And still more, he has learned how to narrate the gospel story in the simple language of his people, and adapt it to their circumstances, so that it becomes a living and present history, and the events themselves stand out in bold relief before his congregation. This is the secret of his influence rather than any peculiarity of style or originality of expression. Römheld, with these rare qualities, seeks to make this book a Bible story for the elementary schools of Germany, and he certainly has met with rare success thus far. This is accounted for by the fact that he for a time was a practical teacher, himself under the guidance of one of the most renowned pedagogues of the land; this gives him easier access to the teachers, and a readier acquiescence to his methods. The principles that he lays down for imparting these truths are a treasure of pedagogic wisdom, and his methods a useful key to the popular work. He makes a careful selection of his narratives, dropping Job, for instance, and taking Daniel in the Lion's den, the Centurion of Cornelius, etc. The narratives are sometimes shortened, so as to contain the cream of the event, retaining all the original spirit and coloring, with omission of whatever might perhaps make it too lengthy to secure the undivided attention of the child. Other narratives have been expanded and explained more fully for the same ulterior purpose. All through the work the object is to secure the expression best adapted to effect the purpose of lasting impression on the young mind, so that the story shall be interesting enough to secure the return to it without urging from the teacher. But all through the story the woof is the word of God; that is, Jesus Christ is the real purport of Holy Writ, and thus in the Old Testament the story is of Christ and the Gospel eventually. From the beginning to the end this important elation of the Old to the New is used with care and fidelity. The

author has been careful to avoid any doctrinal teaching; the narrative is to speak for itself, and the doctrines taught are those to be deduced from the divine words. These impressions are heightened by a judicious choice of illustrations from the best collections and the most faithful artists of the day in biblical picturing, Carolsfeld, Richter, Jäger, and Schnorr. We need hardly say that German evangelical Christians are giving the work a hearty approval because it may prove a welcome and admitted messenger to the popular schools where no other would gain admission from its merits so much as from authority. The Germans still see the necessity of teaching the Bible to the young in the secular schools, and wisely, instead of excluding it from these Christian scholars, are trying to make it so welcome that it will be invited.

A noble man and pure critic thus speaks of the book to his countrymen: "We congratulate the elementary schools with all our heart at the acquisition of this masterly manual of Scripture teaching, and we wish that it might not be confined to the common school; for biblical teaching it is quite as well adapted to the gymnasium, the scientific schools, and those for our daughters, as it is for the school of the people. And, finally, it is a book for the house and the family, and where it does not gain entrance to the schools let the mother look to it that it at least has a warm welcome in her domain; she can find no better assistant in introducing to her children the cardinal points of Scripture history so that these will remain with them through life." We have purposely lingered on this subject to show our readers the thought that still lies heavily on German minds, amid the rush of all sorts of books circulated to lessen the love of young hearts for the pure Bible teaching as it is in the Saviour's life, and the history that foreshadows and portrays it. It is encouraging that there is still a popular leaven in the Fatherland that may leaven the lump.

SCHNORR'S BIBLE IN PICTURES.

In the same general spirit, and because of its harmony, we allude to the above classical Bible-work, which has become a great national treasure of biblical art. When this great enterprise was started German publishers were inclined to hold aloof from it. But George Wigand took the enterprising author and artist by the hand, and amid the doubts and fears of his compeers, helped him to the execution of some of the finest specimens of woodcut engraving in the annals of their trade. Very soon the leading spirits of that guild gathered around him, and now he was assisted by Flegel, Gaber, Graeff, Aarland, and other notabilities of the craft, whose careful execution of the ideas of the author have helped him to produce a masterpiece of the first rank. The publisher spared no labor nor expense in his part of the work, and spent a modest fortune in the drawing and engraving of the blocks. In order to make these "Bible pictures" accessible to the poor as well as the rich, cheap popular editions have been placed on the counters beside those bound in the height of luxury. Each of these pictures is

provided with a short explanatory text in German, which has lately been extended to the French and English, and the last venture is a polyglot edition, with the text in fourteen languages. So famous a work as this could not fail of the honor of a reproduction. The most important of these is by the house of Didot & Co., Paris; it is entitled, "*La Sainte Bible par Salmon.*" In this the entire number, two hundred and forty sheets, are splendidly reproduced by the heliograph process. As a curiosity we may mention in this connection that the complete Bible has been reproduced by a firm in Holland, in the original size, through what is called lithographic impression, and it is so well done that none but an experienced eye can distinguish it from the original. Full success has crowned these great exertions. The sale, counting the single sheets, each with an engraving, amounts up to the present time to about five millions. The printing is all done by single sheets, and the sale mostly occurs in this way, as special sheets and subjects are most frequently demanded by the public. The publishers generally keep two hundred thousand on hand, and daily sales send forth into all the world this word of God in pictures.

AN IMPERIAL HYMN BOOK.

The Prussian hosts in the last war with France went into battle with the war-cry, "With God for King, and Fatherland!" and when victory was won the venerable leader was the first to order a grand "Praise God!" from all his children; for even the Catholic regiments caught the spirit, and soon learned to sing with their comrades the hymns of Luther. The emperor still wants his army to sing these stirring anthems, and has bidden a conference to meet at Eisenach (a fitting spot) to draw up for it an "Evangelical Hymn and Prayer Book." It was a happy thought to give to the sons of the Fatherland that are still gathered under its flag the best that could be procured of the rich mine of German sacred song, that is now the common property of all, to the end that their common faith might grow strong in times of peace. The poetic power of the German nation in this species of literature is an eloquent testimony of the true Christian heart that beats outside of the limits of all dogmatic strife and jealousy.

The hymns of Germany reflect the noblest conceptions and loftiest strivings of the people, and the day is now past when the choice ones shall wander about the land, like lost children, singing the lays of home. They are to gather about one hundred and fifty others for his army hymn book, and he bids the conference of Eisenach make the choice. The variety of hymnals in evangelical Germany has been very great, no less than sixty in one province of Prussia. This has led the people to desire a selection, and thus this measure is popular throughout Protestant Germany. If the conference has a happy inspiration in the selection, this new collection will doubtless become popular throughout the land, and its introduction into the army may lead to its adoption on the part

of many Churches. It is proposed to have cheap editions, so that schools, charitable institutions, and religious associations of a general character may be induced to adopt it, as well as German families. It will be accompanied by a choral, with about eighty of the most cherished melodies of the German Evangelical Churches. A very pretty thought is that of an imperial birthday hymn to head the collection, and this has been submitted to the authorities for their judgment; the emperor himself will doubtless have a voice in the matter. It is by Julius Strum, and breathes a beautifully patriotic and religious spirit, alluding to their noble chief, and the fact that, by the help of God, he has united his people in the face of their enemies, and done all to the honor of his name, (*Zu Deines Namens Ehre,*) which is the refrain of each of the four verses.

Art. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Translated out of the Greek: being the version set forth A. D. 1611. Compared with the most ancient Authorities, and revised A.D., 1881. Printed for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Oxford, at the University Press, 1881. Long Primer, crown 8vo. All rights reserved.

The History of the Bible: including its Canon, Genuineness, Authenticity, and Inspiration; as also the Ancient Versions and the Famous Manuscripts; a Special Account of the Early English Versions and Revisers, and the Authorized Version of King James; the Reason for and History of the New Revision; the Principles of Revision, and Conditions. With full index. By the Rev. L. T. Chamberlain, D.D., Norwich, Conn. 12mo, pp. 47. The Henry Hill Publishing Company, Norwich, Conn. 1881.

The quiet corps of scholars who so patiently and faithfully toiled through long uncompensated years in the revision scarce imagined to themselves what a commercial sensation they were preparing—what a commotion in the sale of the first editions, and what a tumult in the columns of our daily seculars. And the momentous inference arises that the Bible has not lost its power. It stirs men on both sides of the Atlantic as it never stirred men before. Men, to whom it was apparently a buried book, betray an interest in its pages which slept in their minds unknown, perhaps, even to their own consciousness. We have almost written the conclusion that there is more religion in our world than we had imagined. The prophets of our day, who, inspired by their own wishes, are predicting the downfall of Christianity, will evidently die without the sight.

And there are queries and quandaries in the popular heart. There are some disturbances, well known to scholars, many of

them noted in our commentaries, yet new to the readers of solely the English text. The disappearance of the laceration of the text into separate verses and chapters, the division by paragraphs demanded by the sense, the removal of the figures to the margins, and the printing the poetical quotations in a poetical form, changes which would have been disturbing fifty years ago, are easily welcome now. That little revolution will never go back. But how about tearing off the sublime doxology from the Lord's Prayer and tucking it into the margin? How about a great many forms of expression which thought has consecrated as part of the Bible, and that yet have been ruthlessly substituted by some "human" interpolation?

Now we think it should silence a large amount of complaint to call to mind the great fact that it is a question of TRUTH. Does the revision come more nearly than the old version to the *truth* of the original autographs of the sacred penmen? This is the proper form of the question which the Christian people are now putting to the biblical scholarship of the day. And to that question there can surely come but one unanimous answer. Whatever exceptions can be taken as matters of taste and association, there can be no doubt that the revision is very greatly superior to the old as a presentation of the sacred writings to the English mind. And this to so great a degree as to overbear all other considerations, so that to prefer the old is to prefer at least the less true, if not the untrue.

This question of *truth* regards first the original text, and then the English text of the revision. And when the people ask, Is the revision made from a purer text than that of King James? To that no scholar can withhold a strong affirmation. There is something beautiful in the enthusiasm with which for a century or so the closeted biblical scholars have hunted for and collated manuscripts, and the toil, intellect, and rigid and pure-minded criticism with which they have chastened the text of the copies back into an approximate identity with the apostolic autographs. Here is new truth as opposed to old mistake. A truer Greek Testament is now Englished for our use.

And, secondly, to the question of a more accurate translation of this more accurate text, there can, in *truth*, be but one reply. There is, indeed, one translation which we consider a great blemish, namely, the phrase "evil one" in the Lord's Prayer. In regard to this, as well as the doxology, we advise that the old form, being preserved in our Discipline, should be used in the

public service. The substitution of *love* for *charity* in Corinthians is made in every commentary, is necessarily made in every sermon on that text, and should unquestionably be made in a revision.

We fully indorse the changes by the American revisers, relegated by an Appendix, and wish they had been wrought into the text. It would have been simply a preference of *new truth* to old *untruth*.

The newspapers seem to say that the English public mind rejects the revision. We cannot quite believe that there will be a permanent rejection. It would be a curious duality if the old should be the standard in England and the new in America. The cautions, however, given by the authorities of the Church against an adoption of the new into the public service sporadically by individual clergymen before it has been accepted by the legislation of the Church, is just and wise. Similarly no minister of our own Church should adopt it before the authoritative action of our General Conference.

Hours with the Bible; or, The Scriptures in the Light of Modern Discovery and Knowledge, from Creation to the Patriarchs. By CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE, D.D., author of "The Life and Words of Christ." With illustrations. 12mo, pp. 500. New York: James Pott. 1881.

Dr. Geikie's book wonderfully exemplifies what a world of fresh biblical illustration of Genesis has been flung up by modern research. Some fields, especially the physical science department, present difficulties to be obviated; others, especially archæology, furnish powerful confirmations of the sacred record. With regard to the difficulties coming from the doctrines of genetic evolution and of palæontology, it would, indeed, seem that they are diminishing, as if tending to vanish away. In archæology even the piles of parallel illustration are in a somewhat provisional state, affording apparent ready application in proof, yet needing further discovery and critical treatment. But what verifications of the earliest biblical documents crowd upon us! The Mosaic cosmogony is found to be Abrahamic and primitively Shemitic; for we find that it accords with a blurred parallel account primitively existing in Assyria and Chaldea, whence Abraham emigrated. Then, in the Egyptian part of the Pentateuch, Egyptology finds the writer at home in Egypt at the age of the narrated events. Then, passing from Egypt into the desert, we find his tracks, as followed by modern travel, distinctly traceable,

with all the surroundings his narrative presupposes. That there should be difficulties, our mind almost demands. But the surplus of confirmation is overwhelming, and the general historic truth and clear, simple integrity of the record, are safe beyond all possible impeachment, whether coming from the heavy lore of German criticism, or from the brilliant rhetoric of a Robert Ingersoll.

Of the various publications issued to illustrate and confirm Genesis from the modern researches Dr. Geikie's is fullest, latest, and most erudite. His list of authorities consulted in all the languages of western Europe fills four pages. Among his authorities we find our learned contributor Southall, but miss our brilliant deceased contributor, Tayler Lewis. The present volume, the first of a series, extends from the cosmogony to the decease of Joseph, the last event before the Exodus.

Six chapters are devoted to the cosmogony in its various aspects, and the geological age of the world, two to the creation of man and the Edenic history, and three to the antiquity of man and his primitive condition. Then come the beginning of the race and the deluge in three chapters; the table of the nations and the openings of natural history in two chapters. Thence, narrowing the view to the Messianic race, we have the commencement of the Hebrew nation in one chapter, three very fresh and excellent chapters on Abraham, and we close with one chapter on Isaac and his sons, and a final chapter on Joseph, rich with remarkable illustrations, drawn from secular sources, of the successive events of his life. Upon the whole work we note a few points.

Dr. Geikie favors the belief that the art of writing came from the antediluvian age, transmitted through the ark, bringing with it our most valuable primitive traditions. To this source we may, doubtless, trace the commencing chapters of Genesis.

He calls attention to a significant fact that seems to give a very severe blow to the theory of the Jehovistic-Elohim documents. The Assyrian tablets give these supposed different narratives in one continuous document.

We have good authority for saying there were temperance societies in Egypt, composed at least of the priests, who imposed temperance principles on the kings. "A despot is not easily kept within bounds, however it may have been with the particular Pharaoh whose beverage in the cup-bearer's dream was only grape-juice fresh from the cluster. But that this is a literally correct trait of Egyptian life has been curiously illustrated by a

text discovered by Ebers in the inscriptions of the temple of Edfu, in which the king is seen standing, cup in hand, while underneath are the words, 'They press grapes into the water and the king drinks.'"—P. 465. This demonstrates that Egypt had two kinds of wine, the fermented and the unfermented. It suggests that *the product of the vine* in Luke xxii, 18, as used at the Lord's Supper, was fresh grape-juice. The ingenious sophism that Pharaoh's drinking such juice was "only in a dream" should not be repeated.

The whole work is, within its range, an invaluable popular commentary and a fund of matter for the work of the commentator.

Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. By F. Godet, D.D., Professor of Theology, Neuchatel. Translated from the French by the Rev. A. Cusin, M.A., Edinburgh. Vol. II, 8vo, pp. 434. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George-street. 1881.

The large and stately treatises on Romans of the present day have so uniformly come from the Augustinian side that our highly dogmatical friend, Spurgeon, has come to claim that the Epistle belongs to the Calvinists alone, and that an Arminian is guilty of an impertinence, if not of grand larceny, in taking possession of the Epistle for comment. It is, therefore, refreshing to receive from the Continent of Europe a magnificent exposition from an eminent biblical scholar, taking what we might almost call the Wesleyan positions. Nor is the pleasure diminished by the fact that the work comes by the Edinburgh route, through which such liberal evangelicism seldom travels.

Professor Godet's name has already been introduced to our readers through the "Quarterly" from our notice of his New Testament "Studies." We have also used his aid in our comment on Rev. xiii with good effect. The present work is characterized by its scholarly mastery of the ground, its rich biblical tone, its great lucidity and vivacity of style.

We have only space to indicate his position on a few leading doctrinal points. On the seventh chapter he maintains with great conclusiveness the thesis that the Ego of the closing passage is an unregenerate struggler after righteousness. On viii, 15 he notes that "the apostle has proved the fact of our being sons or children, first by the filial feeling produced in us by the Spirit, and then by *the direct witness of the Spirit himself.*" This important postulate of a true and deep Christian experience he defines briefly but explicitly, and clearly as any Wesleyan has

ask. On viii, 28–30, his views are admirably stated, and his doctrinal position is thus: "Wherein consists the divine predestination undoubtedly taught by the apostle in this passage? Does it, in his view, exclude the free-will of man, or, on the contrary, does it imply it? Two reasons seem to us to decide the question in favor of the second alternative: 1. The act of *foreknowing*, which the apostle makes the basis of predestination, proves that the latter is determined by some fact or other, the object of this knowledge. It matters little that the object is eternal, while the fact, which is its object, comes to pass only in time. It follows all the same from this revelation that the fact must be considered as due in some way to a factor distinct from a divine causation, which can be nothing else than human liberty. 2. The apostle avoids making the act of *believing* the object of the decree of predestination. In the act of predestination faith is already assumed, and its sole object is, according to the apostle's words, the final participation of believers in *the glory of Christ*. Not only, then, does Paul's view imply that in the act of believing full human liberty is not excluded, but it is even implied. For it alone explains the distinction which he already establishes between the two divine acts of *foreknowledge* and *predestination*, both as to their *nature* (the one, an act of the understanding, the other of the will) and as to their *object*, (in the one case faith, in the other glory.") We need hardly say after this that his exposition of the ninth chapter is orthodox after the Wesleyan-Arminian standard.

The Truth of Scripture in Connection with Revelation, Inspiration, and the Canon. By JOHN JAMES GIVEN, Ph.D., Professor of Hebrew and Hermeneutics in Magee College, Londonderry. 8vo, pp. 370. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1881. [Scribner's Edition. Price, $3.]

Our Londonderry professor displays much of the Irish fluency of speech and liveliness of genius, with a good degree of scholarship, and now and then a jet of true originality. Celtic genius, it is well-known, with its rich imagination is capable, also, of a sharp-edged metaphysic.

The volume is tripartite; discussing the three great topics, Revelation, Inspiration, the Canon. The treatment of Revelation from its necessary brevity can touch only on great leading individual topics; mountain-tops that project as islands above the surface of the great sea. They are well selected, often handled with a fine dexterity, and that of miracles, especially, with subtle insight.

On Inspiration he corroborates (p. 304) a view, which we have heretofore advanced, that the reality of the original inspiration of the sacred writings was attested, say in the New Testament, not only by the apostolic characters of the authors and their own consciousness, but by the collective inspired character of the Christian Church which received them. So long as the remains of the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit survived in the apostolic Church, so long as the gift of miracles and the discerning of spirits existed, so long was the Church divinely capacitated to collectively discriminate not only between the truly apostolic and unapostolic teaching and teacher, but between the inspired and uninspired utterances of the apostles themselves. Over the early selection of the canonical documents the great Head of the Church held special guardianship, and specially guided the mind of the Church. Our canon stands on the basis of the double inspiration of the writers and of the Church; the former speaking and the latter confirming. And this may serve to solve the difficulty often raised from the mistake of Peter at Antioch, and from the probability that many a letter was written by Paul and other apostles that never entered the canon. See our commentary on Gal. ii, 11–21; 1 Cor. xi, 16; xiv, 33.

There are, as special features of this volume, an able and very conclusive defense of the Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes, and a summary of the discussion, so deeply now agitating the Church of Scotland in the matter of Professor Robertson Smith, in regard to the canonicity of the Book of Deuteronomy.

We quote the following fresh and pertinent illustration of what is sometimes called "the double sense" of Scripture: "Who does not know that Spenser, in his *Faery Queen*, while celebrating certain personified virtues, alludes in a manner unmistakable to certain distinguished personages, so that Sir Artigael at once represents *Justice* and *Lord Grey;* Duessa, *Falsehood* and the unfortunate *Queen of Scots;* the Red Cross Knight, both *Holiness* and the *Church?* while Spencer's own letter to Raleigh clearly states the plan as follows: 'In the *Faery Queen* I mean Glory in my general intention, but in my particular I conceive the most excellent and glorious person of our sovereign the Queen (Elizabeth) and her kingdom in Faery Land. And yet in some places I do otherwise shadow her; for, considering she beareth two persons, the one of a most royal queen or empress, the other of a most virtuous and beautiful lady, this latter part in some places I do express in Belphœbe.'"

The Incarnate Saviour: A Life of Jesus Christ. By Rev. W. R. NICOLL, M.A., Kelso. 12mo, pp. 388. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1881. 1

Both in the externals of paper, print, and margins, and in the transparency, and often the eloquence of its style, this is a beautiful book. Among the many biographical delineations of the Saviour, the specialty of this is claimed to be that it designs to present the conception of Christ in his incarnate unity, so that we may think of him as the divine pervading the human. And in the matter of miracles, they are not viewed so much as proofs of the revelation, but simply as an integral part of Christ's divine self-manifestation. This is a valuable conception, and capable of a very comprehensive statement. The manifestation of the Son of God may in fact be called the only miracle, and all other miracles are but sparkles from that one great conflagration, attendants upon and truly parts of it. It is the one antithesis to nature. The antecedent miracles of the Old Testament were premonitory sparks of that divine Presence; those of the New Testament were its direct effects and issues. If the Divine must come not only into the physical, but the human world, there must be an incarnation; if he is to be transcendently human, there must be the sublimest of suffering and death; if he must die and yet be manifest as divine, there must be a resurrection and an ascension.

A History of Christian Doctrines. By the late Dr. R. R. HAGENBACH, Professor of Theology at Basel. Translated from the Fifth and Last German Edition, with Additions from Other Sources. With an Introduction by E. W. PLUMTRE, D.D., Professor of Divinity in King's College, London; Examining Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Vol. II, 8vo, pp. 466. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George-street. 1880. [Scribner's specially imported edition, price $3.]

The present volume of this valuable work covers the great and important historic space between the death of Origen and the establishment of Protestantism, extending from A. D. 254 to 1720. It, therefore, portrays the rise of systematic theology, producing gradually the formation of the scholasticism of the Middle Ages and finding its termination, or at least its downfall, in the *Renaissance.* The author divides the contents of the volume into three periods: the Age of Polemics, or discussion; of Systematic Theology; and, at the Reformation, of Polemico-Ecclesiastical Symbolism.

It is a matter of great interest, as well as a necessary equipment for a veritable theologian, to trace the progess of Christian thought through the Christian ages. That thought flows like a mighty Mississippi through nearly two millenniums. If the im-

mediate details sometimes present puerilities or eccentricities, yet the great body of doctrine, being the doctrine which forms that Christianity which has created so wonderful a Christendom as we have, is as a whole so grandly consistent in its substance and so majestic in its flow as to raise a profound and rational wonder. The great outlines of doctrine, held by the Greek, the Roman, and Anglican Churches, wonderfully coincide, forming an orthodox system, excluding temporary heresies, and enabling us to feel a security in being based upon, or, at least, not wandering far from, the fundamentals of the general Church. Hence a hearty mental embracement of Dogmatic History is a great regulator of our individual faith, giving us stability of belief, and enabling us to view new inventions in theology with a healthful skepticism.

Able as this work is, and standing practically almost alone for the student of our day, we view it as in some degree provisional. History, like commentary, is often colored by the spectacles of the historian; and quite often the hues of Hagenbach's glasses are thrown upon his pages. A history with a different, if not a neutral, tint, will, we trust, some day appear, rising from a different theological quarter.

The Angels of God. By Lewis R. Dunn, D.D., author of "The Mission of the Spirit," etc. Small 12mo, pp. 295. New York: Phillips & Hunt; Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1881.

Within the limits of Scripture mainly Dr. Dunn brings together the various indications that form our idea of the angels. It is an attractive subject, appealing to our higher powers of imagination, and furnishing to the writer ample scope for beautiful thought in beautiful words. He unfolds to our view their origin, form, powers, names, orders, number, and employments. Then he discusses the dark and weird topic of the fallen angels, Satan, demons, and demoniacs. There are those among us who ask, How is it that in our day the angels have so gone up into the upper heaven that they are never seen? And in the present current supernaturalisms, including not only the phenomena of spiritualism, but the system of second sight, wraiths, and apparitions, they are never matters of even imaginary experience at the present day. Probably the angels do not associate with such company. But, in the matter of a purer and more blessed experience, Dr. Dunn gives us cheering mention of angelic revelations to dying saints even in our own day.

Circumstantial Evidences of Christianity. By DANIEL CAREY. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe; New York: Phillips & Hunt. 1881.

The common method with writers on the "Evidences" is to connect their argument with some particular theory of inspiration, and to identify the truth of Christianity with the verbal infallibility of the Bible. To some thinkers, however, it seems to be becoming the preferable view that Christianity depends not on the formal perfection of the record, but on the substantial truth of its leading facts. The work in hand is written from this standpoint. The author finds certain undoubted facts in the history of both the Old and the New Testament which find their explanation only in the essential truth of the Christian system. The work is not profound enough for scholars, but would be useful for its own class of thinkers.

The Christ. Seven Lectures. By ERNEST NAVILLE. Translated from the French. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1880. [New York: Scribner's specially imported edition. Price $2.]

The idea of these Lectures is that Christ is Christianity, and that all discussion of the divinity of Christianity must center around Christ himself. Christ is presented in the several relations of Teacher, Comforter, Redeemer, Legislator, and Lord. The aim is to show that in all these relations Christ appears as something new and divine. There is a break of historical continuity and a corresponding historical effect, which can be accounted for on the assumption that a new life had come down from above. The argument is briefly presented, owing to conditions of the lecture-plan, but it is in the highest degree suggestive and valuable.

The Brotherhood of Men; or, Christian Geology. By Rev. WILLIAM UNSWORTH. Published for the Author at the Wesleyan Conference Office. London. 1881.

The author aims to expound the duties of the Christian as a member of society. An extreme individualism and subjectivism have prevailed in religious thought and have largely banished the idea of social duties from the popular mind. All the more necessary is it to insist upon the fact that society itself is a moral institution, and that the moral task must include the effort to make all social and political forms and relations concrete expressions of moral ideas. Ethics claim not only the inner purpose, but also the whole realm of outward manifestation. The book in hand will be found useful in giving one an idea of the work required and of its difficulty and importance.

Young Workers in the Church; or, The Training and Organization of Young People for Christian Activity. By Rev. T. B. Neely, A. M. With an Introduction by Bishop Matthew Simpson. Small 12mo, pp. 218. New York: Phillips & Hunt; Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1881.

This is a small but spirited book on a great subject. There are few problems of greater practical importance than that of bringing the Church of Christ into a spirit and state of general and individual activity and enterprise. This is the true hope of the world for spiritual success and ultimate salvation. Mr. Neely's book is an admirable contribution to this end. He means business not only for a whole, but for every individual member of the Church not incapacitated. He has studied the subject in its minute details and practical bearings. He aims not only to quicken the spirit, but to show the way. It is a book for pastors, for officials, and especially for every young person entering the Christian life.

Christianity's Challenge, and some Phases of Christianity, submitted for Candid Consideration. By Rev. Herrick Johnson, D.D. 12mo, pp. 269. Chicago: Cushing, Thomas, & Co. 1881.

With something of the air of an official *champion* Dr. Johnson takes stand on the summit of the pedestal of Christianity, and issues his "challenge" to the opposing hosts. He is a positive aggressor; puts them on the defense, and threatens them with rout. Based upon Christianity's book, Christianity's Christ, Christianity's definite gospel, a Christianity above failure, a Christianity presenting the alternatives of eternal death and eternal life, he affirms that Christianity is the highest source of happiness, and the surest guide in the business of life. The argument is bold, impressive, and well sustained. The book would be a fine present to be put into the hands of any thoughtful but wavering person.

The Golden Dawn; or, Light on the Great Future, in this Life, through the Dark Valley, and in the Life Eternal, as seen in the Best Thoughts of over three hundred leading Authors and Scholars. Illustrated. By Rev. J. H. Potts, Editor of "Christian Advocate," Detroit; author of "Pastor and People," etc. 8vo, pp. 608. Philadelphia and Chicago: P. W. Ziegler & Co. 1880.

In spite of its somewhat sensational title, Mr. Potts has given us a valuable book on the most momentous points of human destiny. His topics are, in series, Death, The Dying, Immortality, The Millennium and Second Advent, The Resurrection of the Dead, The General Judgment, The Punishment of the Wicked, and The Reward of the Righteous. On these themes he has, in successive chapters, brought together a selection of the best thoughts

of eminent thinkers, so that we have the doctrines of the Church, expressed in choicest language, by her best expositors, on the final things. It will be interesting and salutary reading for both theologians and popular readers.

The Methodist Office Bearer, June, 1881. Terms, 60 cents a year in advance. 8vo, pp. 96. Detroit, Mich.: Methodist Book Depository. John Willyoung.

The issuing a periodical devoted to the discipline and organic operations of our Church was a happy thought, and, well carried out, may produce many valuable results. To our ministers it brings information, suggestions, and reminders, well calculated to stimulate and direct in practical action. The present number embraces valuable paragraphs on the General Rules, the Articles of Faith, the work of the ministry and of the officiary, and Sunday-schools. The enterprising editor, Rev. J. H. Potts, has done it up externally in fine taste, in a form well-fitted for binding, and suggesting that its volumes will be a future depository of ecclesiastical facts and principles.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Island Life; or, The Phenomena and Causes of Insular Faunas and Floras; including a Revision and attempted Solution of the Problem of Geological Climates. By Alfred Russel Wallace, author of "The Geographical Distribution of Animals," etc. 8vo, pp. xvi, 522. New York: Harper & Brothers.

It is well known that Mr. Wallace might justly dispute with Mr. Darwin the honor of having originated the now very famous theory of development by natural selection. As an author he became known by his work on the "Malay Archipelago," and (in 1870) his "Contribution to the Theory of Natural Selection;" and, about four years ago, he gave to the world his two substantial volumes on "The Geographical Distribution of Animals," a work worthy to be placed alongside of those of Darwin and Lyell in the field of biological and geological research. The present volume is, as the author tells us in his Preface, designed to be supplementary to this last-named work, and to be of a more popular character. It may be regarded, however, as in fact a more deliberate and matured expression of Mr. Wallace's views as to the origin of the present island faunas and floras of the globe—the tracing back of them to their original ancestors, and an explanation of how they became *what* they are, and *where* they are. The

appearance of a South American species in the far-off islands of the Indian Ocean, or of the plants of Great Britain in the island of Japan, was naturally pointed to by the opponents of evolution as an insurmountable objection in the way of that theory. They found the barn-owl (*Strix flammea*) in countries the most remote from each other; the osprey, or fishing-hawk, at once in Brazil, South Africa, the Malay Islands, and Tasmania; and the raven extending from the Arctic regions to Texas and New Mexico, as well as to India and Lake Baikal in Asia. We and they were naturally driven to infer that the same specific form had, on the theory of development, been produced in different parts of the world. Yet more perplexing is it to find two species of the serpentine amphibia, *Cœcilia oxyura* and *Cœcilia rostrata*, in the Seychelles Islands, and, at the same time, one of these species on the Malabar coast, and the other in West Africa and South America. We find the same fact illustrated in connection with the dispersion of plants. Identical plants appear in Scandinavia, in India, in New South Wales, in New Zealand, and in Iceland. Thirty-nine species of the plants of New Zealand are identical with species found in Europe, and there are eleven species common to New Zealand and South America.

Lyell and recent English geologists got over these difficulties by boldly affirming that during the vast periods of geological time the existing continents and ocean-basins of the globe have, more than once, changed places, and that continental areas have stretched across the widest seas. But Mr. Wallace joins issue with the school of Lyell on this point, and undertakes to prove, by incontestable facts, that the existing continents were outlined from the beginning, as long ago taught by Professor Dana, and that the waters have rolled over the "deep unfathomed caves of ocean" from the most remote period. It becomes necessary, therefore, for Mr. Wallace to explain the wide distribution of genera and species on other grounds; and this he undertakes to accomplish, in part, by showing that, while there was no continental extension between two such remote areas, for example, as Madagascar and the Malay Archipelago, there has existed in times, more or less remote, *a chain of considerable islands* connecting Southern Africa and Southern Asia. Even this would involve upheavals of the ocean bottom to the extent of a thousand fathoms.

We have in this connection an incidental discussion of the existence in tertiary times of the supposed *Lemurian continent*

between Madagascar and the Indian peninsula. By many arguments, and especially appealing to the results obtained by the recent deep-sea soundings, it is shown, that no such continental area existed in tertiary times; and the significance of this becomes apparent when we remember that it is on the existence of this continent that many evolutionists rely in order to connect man with the lower animals. It is in the rocks of this sunken continent, they allege, that we should find the missing links between man and the apes, if we could have access to its paleontological treasures; for here, they tell us, was the special *habitat* of the anthropomorphous apes. With the annihilation of this fancy, and in view of the entire absence of all such links in the tertiary beds of the existing continents, the advocates of the derivation of man from lower animal forms are left entirely without any *evidence* of the fact; and there the matter rests. Mr. Wallace, it is well known, has never pushed the theory of development so as to include our *homo sapiens*.

The first part of the present work applies itself to the establishment and mapping out of the different "zoological regions;" the "Palearctic," the "Ethiopian," the "Oriental," etc. The author then proceeds to show that the existence of these zoological provinces is the necessary result of the "law of evolution"—tracing the origin, growth, and decay of species and genera. The next subject considered is the means by which the various groups of animals are enabled to overcome the natural barriers which often seem to limit them to very restricted areas, and what are the exact nature and amount of the changes of sea and land experienced by the earth in past ages. The author then takes up the consideration of the set of changes—those of climate—which have probably been agents of the first importance in modifying specific forms and in the dispersion of animals. Three chapters, in this connection, are devoted to the Causes of Glacial Epochs. Here the author finds only two explanations suggested, which seem tenable; and while adopting generally Mr. Croll's views as to the causes of the "glacial epoch," he introduces certain limitations and modifications of that theory. From this examination the important conclusion is reached that the alternate phases of precession—causing the winter in each hemisphere to be in aphelion and perihelion each 10,500 years—would produce a complete change of climate only where a country was *partially* snow-clad; while, whenever a large area became almost *wholly* buried in snow and ice, as was certainly the case with Northern

Europe during the glacial epoch, then the glacial conditions would be continued, and perhaps even intensified, when the sun approached nearest the earth in winter, instead of there being at that time, as Mr. Croll maintains, an almost perpetual spring. With regard to the existence of glacial epochs in earlier times it is shown that Mr. Croll's views are opposed by a vast body of facts.

The general conclusion is reached that geographical conditions are the primary cause of great changes of climate, and that the radically different distribution of land and sea in the northern and southern hemispheres has generally led to great diversity of climate in the arctic and antarctic regions. It is only in recent times that the great northern continents have become so completely consolidated as they at present are, so as to shut out the warm water from their interiors, and render possible a wide-spread and intense glacial epoch. But this great climatic change was actually brought about by the high eccentricity which occurred about 200,000 years ago. It is, thus, the *concurrence* of the astronomical causes with the geographical revolutions which has resulted in bringing about glacial conditions. The glacial age lasted, we are told, about 120,000 years, and closed about 80,000 years ago.

Mr. Wallace proceeds then to one of the most interesting discussions in the volume—geological time as bearing on the development of the organic world. Geologists in the past have generally represented that geological time had to be measured by hundreds of millions rather than by millions of years. We believe that Mr. Darwin estimated that the denudation of the weald alone demanded more than 300,000,000 of years. Geologists have dwelt continually on the slowness of the processes of upheaval and subsidence, of denudation, and of the deposition of strata; while, on the theory of development, as expounded by Mr. Darwin, the variation and modification of organic forces is also exceedingly slow. Most geologists regarded the estimate of Sir Charles Lyell, of 240,000,000 of years since the Cambrian period, as very moderate; and Mr. Darwin, in his "Origin of Species," remarks, that before the Cambrian period commenced long periods had elapsed—probably far longer than the whole interval from the Cambrian age to the present day. Professor Huxley has expressed himself in terms equally strong as to the enormous periods which are required for the development of the higher forms of life; and Mr. Wallace remarks, that, according to these views, "the date of the commencement of life on the earth

cannot be less than 500,000,000 of years." On the other hand, physicists pointed out that the earth must once have been too hot to support life; while the friction of the tides is checking the earth's rotation, and this cannot have gone on indefinitely without making our day much longer than it is. A limit is therefore placed to the age of the habitable earth; and it was argued that the time so allowed was much too short for the long processes of the geologists and biologists. Mr. Wallace undertakes to demonstrate, that no such enormous periods are required. The rate of denudation, he says, has been recently approximately measured; and if, then, we take the *maximum* thickness of the *known* sedimentary rocks to represent the *average* thickness of *all* the sedimentary rocks, and we know also the *amount* of sediment carried to the sea, and the *area* on which that sediment is spread, we have a means of calculating the *time* required for the building up of all the sedimentary rocks of the geological system. The mean rate of denudation over the whole earth is about one foot in three thousand years; therefore the rate of *maximum* deposition (deposition going on as compared with denudation in the ratio of 19 to 1,) will be at least nineteen feet in the same time; and as the total *maximum* thickness of all the stratified rocks of the globe, according to Professor Haughton, is 177,200 feet, the time required to produce this thickness of rock, at the present rate of denudation and deposition, is only 28,000,000 years—a considerable reduction on Lyell, Darwin, and Huxley.

The author then proceeds to the discussion of a series of typical insular faunas and floras, with a view to explain the phenomena they present, and in a number of chapters passes in review the faunas and floras of the Azores and Bermuda, St. Helena and the Sandwich Islands, the British Isles, Borneo and Java, Japan and Formosa, Madagascar, Seychelles, Mauritius, New Zealand, etc.

We have rather undertaken to present to the reader an outline of Mr. Wallace's views than to criticise them. We will only remark that a great deal of the book is mere *speculation*.

We need only add that the Messrs. Harper, in bringing out this very valuable work, have gotten it up in their most attractive style. S.

Religion and Chemistry. A Restatement of an Old Argument. By Josiah Parsons Cooke. 12mo., pp. 331. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1880.

The first edition of Professor Cooke's volume we welcomed from the Scribner press twenty years ago, and we rejoice to see this

re-issue, revised in subordinate points, brought down to the latest data of science, yet identical in spirit, purpose, and form of the original argument. Most persons are prone to hold chemistry to be as destitute of religious interpretation as arithmetic; but under Professor Cooke's treatment the acids and the alkalis, the oxygens and the nitrogens, all primordial nature, speak articulately for God.

The Atheism of the present day, assuming the eternity of the properties and laws of matter, claims that all the phenomena of our cosmos are explained without the need of an antecedent Mind. Professor Cooke shows that it is in the very sum total of these properties and laws that we must recognize Plan; the existence of which can be solved by nothing but antecedent Mind. And this touches upon the peculiar skeptical effect of the exclusive pursuit of natural science upon the scientific intellect. The scientist's task is to make his deductions solely from premises within the bounds of physical nature. All thought of supernatural interposition is to be excluded. Nay, the assumption of supernatural causation has so often led astray from true natural causation that he has often grown impatient of the thought of a supernatural, and even of a God. Now Professor Cooke's view well works a remedy for this impatience. It finds Plan, Design, Mind, in the *primordial endowing of matter with its laws and properties*, and thus secures the existence of primordial Mind and yet leaves the scientist full range for his unobstructed deduction of natural phenomena from natural causations. This by no means excludes the recognition of a Design in the infinitely varied special adaptations in every part of nature, but rather elucidates and confirms them. When we recognize Design in the primordial we will readily see that all the specialties are provided for, and we have a grand view of *the whole* as a sublime Unit. So that when we are sarcastically asked, Is india rubber made for us to rub out pencil marks? Is the quill put into the wing of a goose for us to write with? Are lamp-black and oil purposely endowed in order to make printer's ink? we reply very promptly, Yes. Divine prescience foreknows the minutest needs of free agents, and divine predestination adjusts the properties of nature by a Plan which (as Pope says)

> Binding nature fast in fate
> Lets free the human will.

In tracing the divine Plan which reigns throughout the primordial system, showing how oxygen and water and carbon and

nitrogen, play their respective parts in the drama of nature, our professor displays great freshness and lucidity of style. Seldom have the fascinating mysteries of nature been laid open more clearly to the popular eye. Albeit you know little or nothing of chemistry, open the pages of his book with an eager mind and you will wonder, when you are done, how much you do know of the various windings by which nature adapts herself to an infinite variety of apparently casual needs. You are delighted to find the slightest minutiæ of life fastened by threads of infinite length back to the Primordial Origin.

One spurious reconciliation of science with Scripture by the professor we must, however, reject. He makes science accord with the doctrine of the resurrection of the body by really expunging that resurrection from the Scripture, and substituting a something else which is not a resurrection. Surely the creating and interpolating a new body in place of our mortal and dying body is not a resurrection of the dying body. And really so far from his successfully refuting the doctrine of a true resurrection, we can find in the professor's own beautiful words the most striking scientific illustration of our doctrine. Says he, "Are you aware that the brilliant gem you prize so highly [the diamond] is the same element as these black coals? The diamond is simply crystallized carbon." Now our mortal bodies are as the charcoal, and our resurrection bodies are as the diamonds. A charcoal could be transformed particle for particle by mere rearrangement into a diamond. So a dead human body could be divinely transformed, particle for particle, by mere rearrangement into a glorified body. In the transformation of the charcoal to the diamond, the diamond is the same with the charcoal in substance, it is different in properties and powers. So in the resurrection the glorified body is the same in substance as the dead body; it is different in properties and powers. It is *alter et idem.*

Our professor then goes on to unfold that wonderful "allotropism" so-called; wonderful to even scientific men; by which the same substance or aggregate of particles, undergoes by a change of arrangement a new set of properties. His unfoldings are all to our point. Carbon may be either charcoal, graphite or diamond. Our bodily resurrection similarly is simply an "allotropism." At his transfiguration the body of Jesus underwent an allotropic glorifying change. It was the same in substance in that glorification as it was in its normal state. It was *alter et idem.* The dead body of our Lord underwent a similar allotropic change.

The material frame put on immortality and ascended, a glorified body, to the right hand of God. Nor should a writer who so splendidly portrays the glorious possibilities of matter as our author stumble at even this apotheosis of the God-man's body.

The professor holds the resurrection to be contradiction to the scientific fact that our bodies are changed in substance at least once a year. This year's body is entirely new; similar in form but different in substance from last year's body. But the successional changes in the body do not affect the question so long as we admit the great principle of the indestructibility of matter, and understand that it is the frame which dies that rises again. And here again we find not contradiction but illustration. Just as this year's body takes the last year's body and carries it into a formal continuance, so the resurrection goes to the body that has died, takes up its particles, and carries it into a glorified continuance. There is corporeal continuance in both cases; continuance by identity of form and variation of substance in one case; continuance by identity of substance and variance of properties in the other case. In both cases we have a continuance with a variation; an *idem* and an *alter*. There is, indeed, in the allotropism of the resurrection a long break; an interval in which the charcoal is scattered to the four winds and has to be re-collected when the diamond change is ready. That interval is a violent, and, as we may say, an unnatural one. It was introduced by sin. In his higher unfallen nature man would have passed, unchanged in substance, into his transcendent state. He might have *grown* into the now resurrection state by a gradual "allotropism," and that allotropism, like the allotropism so well described in nature by our author, would have been a change not of corporeal particles, but of corporeal properties. And so at the coming of Christ the living undergo a *change;* not merely by a substitution of new bodies, but by putting upon their "mortal" the properties of "immortality." It will be what our professor well understands as an "allotropic" change.

We have elsewhere (in our note to 1 Cor. xv) put a question which we here repeat; repeat with emphasis, because it has never been answered; and we believe has no answer. When the undressed spirit is to appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, all, even our professor, admit that it is to be invested with a body. From the surrounding universe the elements must collect in corporeal accretion around that spirit. *Why, then, under the power of God, may it not be the elements of that frame which was*

dissolved at death, which shall again form around that same spirit, just as easily as any other elements? Our professor has not in his Lectures unfolded the wonders of Magnetism. Had he done so we should have thence drawn another illustration of the molecular identity of the body at death and the body of the resurrection. Between the soul and its forsaken molecules there may exist a quasi-magnetic attraction. At the sublime instant, every individual particle, whether at the farthest pole, or at the antipodes, feels the irresistible draw and in an eye-twinkle assumes its proper place in the new incorporation. And, in obedience to this final attraction every particle of one body at death may be secured or withdrawn from incorporation with another dying body; so that all resurrection bodies shall be separate and individual. This spiritual magnetic attraction is not more wonderful than gravitation. It is not more wonderful than the various specific cohesions that hold each body in organic unity; not half so wonderful as those powerful, infinitely varied, elective affinities so vividly described in these Lectures.

Our professor excels in quotation of beautifying texts, but not in his application of proof-texts. Thus he says, "the apostle declares that this body is not the body that shall be." Certainly not, we reply, for it now "is" charcoal, and it "shall be diamond." "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God;" no more than charcoal can adorn the queen's coronet. "This mortal must put on immortality;" but, according to the professor, "this mortal" is to be scattered through the universe and abandoned to eternal dissolution. It is never to have resurrection. The "immortality" is to be worn by a newly created body that never was "mortal." But he omits one text often quoted by deniers of the resurrection: "God giveth it a body as hath pleased him;" namely, it "hath pleased" God to "give it" a diamond "body," instead of a charcoal one.

Historical Studies in Church Building in the Middle Ages. By CHARLES ELIOT NORTON. New York: Harper & Brothers.

In this work Prof. Norton, one of the few accomplished art critics in America, presents a most interesting historical account of three of the chief Italian cathedrals, those of Venice, Siena, and Florence.

In the first chapter he traces the outlines of social and artistic changes which marked the so-called dark ages, the transition period, between classical and Christian civilization. He then gives an account of the civic, social, industrial, and artistic life

of the three republics of Venice, Siena, and Florence, showing how all the elements of civilization in these great mediæval cities found their concrete crystallization in the cathedrals of those cities. The principle of the union of Church and State which Constantine imposed upon the Roman Empire was continued in all the kingdoms, republics, and free cities which arose upon the ruins of the empire in the occident. The Christian Church was one in faith and organization. National life was intense, amid the turbulence of the Middle Ages, to a degree and with a subdivision which seems strange to us in modern times. Italian cities, the spires of whose cathedrals were in sight of each other, and whose bells re-echoed the call to divine service on holy days, cherished as bitter mutual hatred as do the Russians and the Turks at the present time.

Before the *Renaissance*, even more universally then during that period, a native and natural love for art pervaded all mediæval society. Art thus assumed new and original forms. It was a genuine growth, not a forced exotic production. The love of the beautiful, the intense devotion to the Church, which was not entirely free from worldly ambition and passions, and the pride in the individual life of the cities, all found a common meeting ground in the cathedral churches. Here also the distinguished patriotic dead were buried, and thus family ties and affections were bound to the central religious edifices of the cities; and the history of a cathedral in an Italian city is thus almost a history of the city itself, or of the republic of which it is the capital. The historian, the artist, and the cultured traveler in general, all find in these venerable edifices most thrilling records of human achievement in art, religion, and arms, and delight in unending returnings to these monumental shrines.

Professor Norton has selected three cathedral churches which represent fully as well as any others in Italy the mode of erection and growth of these edifices. For it is to be remembered that few if any of the great churches of Italy or Europe have been completed upon the plans of the original designs. The centuries that passed from the laying of their foundation stones to their completion witnessed many variations in the fortunes and weal of the cities, and great changes in the artistic spirit and manner. The mode of variation in architectural style of these three great cathedrals is traced with delicacy and force. The change of design for the covering of the Cathedral of Florence, the bold work of Brunelleschi in building the *Renaissance* dome

over the Gothic vaults, the friendly rivalry among artists for the commission for the gate of the Baptistry, and described with skill and power, giving firm insight into the spirit of the stirring ages when the arts achieved so great and memorable triumphs. The noble pulpit of the Cathedral of Siena, the tower of Giotto in Florence, the mosaics of St. Mark's, also are portrayed with a masterly hand.

Professor Norton does not venture a decisive opinion as to the cause or motive of the irregularities of construction in the dome of the Cathedral of Siena, but inclines, rather too strongly, we think, to the view that they were intended to produce refined æsthetic effect. The irregularities in the Italian churches differ so greatly from the refined variations of time in the Parthenon, that we think they can only be attributed to the imperfect construction, notwithstanding the fact that the results are, in some instances, exceedingly picturesque. The errors in inorganic, unconstructive decoration in the Italian Gothic churches are pointed out with clearness. This and other errors in many of the great structures of mediæval times should receive careful attention from American architects, who are so often inclined to copy or imitate whatever has been done in other ages in art, as if all is alike good, because done in a former age.

As a whole this work by Professor Norton is one of the most valuable original American contributions to critical, artistic literature, the department in literature which is the most meagerly represented in this country. The author would confer a favor upon the public by continuing his investigations and writings in this direction, and giving a similar treatment to the Cathedrals of Milan, Pisa, and Orvieto, and to the churches of Assisi, Padua, Verona, and other Italian cities. C.

The Relations of Science and Religion. The Morse Lecture, 1880, connected with the Union Theological Seminary, New York. By HENRY CALDERWOOD, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, University of Edinburgh, author of "Relations of Mind and Brain," etc. 12mo, pp. 323. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1881.

In his dissertatory parts, on general principles, Dr. Calderwood is prolix and prosy; but when he comes to facts he discusses them acutely and effectively. He is especially excellent on the subjects of spontaneous generation and the relations of brain to mind. Striking is the fact that the brain of the highest apes approach nearest to man, while their intelligence is inferior to that of bees and ants, which have no brain at all.

History, Biography, and Topography.

The Antislavery Struggle and Triumph in the Methodist Episcopal Church. By Rev. L. C. MATLACK, D.D. With an Introduction by Rev. D. D. WHEDON, D.D. 12mo, pp. 379. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1881.

Doubtless the Philadelphia Conference, many years ago, when the mild-spoken and courteous young Matlack presented himself for admission, took him to be a malleable sort of a gentleman. It was such a surprise to find this supposed man of wax to be a man of steel, that in disgust at his metal it gave him a walking-paper. He walked, but in due time he returned. And now, in the same spirit of gentle firmness, he presents us the history of the great cause which steeled him to temporizing proposals. A new generation has arisen which needs the rehearsal of that great conflict and the part which our Methodism acted in its drama. Elliott's monumental work, "The Great Secession," is a store-house of facts and documents well worth preservation; but its magnitude, as well as its termination before the death of slavery, leaves ample demand for a brief, clear, and impartial history of the entire revolution. This Dr. Matlack has well done. There are many who should master this history, and there are few who take up the work who will not feel drawn by its fascination to its *finis*.

A first chapter gives the origin and nature of slavery, and narrates the period of war by Methodism against it in America, which terminates in 1800. Next the period of the Methodistic toleration of slavery, not without agitation, down to 1836. Then follow chapters of struggle and awakening, closing with the Southern secession in 1844. Then chapters of antagonism, victory, and final extirpation. In a "glance at other Churches" the verdict over the whole is, "The comparison of records is largely in favor of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Forty years of unqualified condemnation of slavery, alternated by twenty years of indifference or toleration, is succeeded by twenty other years of antislavery conflict, which ultimate in extirpation." That memorably adopted word EXTIRPATION, almost prophetically placed upon our record by the fathers at the beginning, unchangeably maintained through the darkest hours of the invading foe, and beaming out in the day of victory, suggests that our testimony, though through a long interval asleep, was never dead.

Though rejected and proscribed by the Church of his choice,

Dr. Matlack did not, like Garrison and his immediate sympathizers, think it necessary to renounce his religion. Among the original Methodist abolition leaders, so far as we can recollect, the only such apostatizer was Leroy Sunderland. Probably the Methodist leaders had such internal consciousness of the reality of their own religion that they were not overthrown by the shortcomings of others. In our reminiscences of the contests in our New York East Conference the names of the leaders on both sides are still mentioned with unchanged veneration. The "Conservatives" were the elder class, and have all departed; such as Nathan Bangs, Heman Bangs, James H. Perry, and John Kennaday, pure and noble men. The antislavery leaders, Floy, Curry, Hatfield, Inskip, Woodruff, are all, save the first, still with us, and the honors of the Church bestowed upon them are proof of her estimate of the victory.

Dr. Matlack has been mistakenly accused of historical mistakes. He does not fail "to note the unwritten law, that the episcopacy must be kept free" from slavery. He states that "law" fully and explicitly, page 155, as source of the great crisis which divided the Church.

The nature of the action of the General Conference of 1844 in regard to the secession seems to us to be correctly stated by Dr. Matlack, namely, as a plan to take effect only in case the South seceded. He does, indeed, state that the motion for appointing the committee proposed that it "devise a constitutional plan for division." But, when he states the "plan" actually devised, he repeatedly states its conditional character. Thus he says: "A plan was presented by them to be adhered to '*in the event of a separation.*'" "All these things were *conditioned* upon the occurrence of a state of things indicated thus: 'Should the Annual Conferences in the slave-holding States find it necessary to unite in a distinct ecclesiastical organization.'" His whole narrative shows that the separation was *understood to be*, and really *was*, the voluntary act of the South alone; though he might have pointed out more explicitly the care then taken to throw the whole responsibility upon the South. It was not "a plan of separation," but a plan for our action after the South had made the separation.

Our historian shows his fairness in the calm and clear manner in which he states the grounds taken by both sides. Our own views as varying from his, in some degree, are stated in an Introduction. But we unhesitatingly recommend the work as reliably accurate in all its statements of facts.

The book has an epic unity. It begins with an original sin and misery, passes through an era of darkness and struggle, and closes with the victory of Right. It abounds in pictures of martyr-like heroism, and even those who do not always see the wisdom of certain parts will indulge a sympathy for men who suffered for conscience' sake and in the cause of everlasting righteousness. The time has arrived, too, when large-minded Southerners, like Wightman, M'Tyeire, and Summers, will recognize the nobleness of this their struggle for freedom. They will see something besides "Pharisaism" in their stand against wrong, and clearly understand that what is called their "hatred of the South" was simply a moral abhorrence of an institution in the South which was the common enemy of both North and South. The night and the nightmare have passed; let us together rejoice in the morning joy.

Reminiscences, by Thomas Carlyle. Edited by JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE. 12mo, pp. 337. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

The many faithful readers of our Quarterly will, perhaps, on casting a retrospective glance, recognize that if Carlyle has been an idol of ours our worship has been, as Mr. Huxley says, "mostly of the silent sort." Without denying him talent, or even a flicker of genius, and an extended reading, we have never dipped into the pages of his successive publications without a feeling that the *dip* was quite sufficient. We ever received the immediate impression that we were contemplating the elaborate performances of a most determined sensationalist. Life with us seems too brief and too serious to spend its responsible hours in waiting upon the harlequinades of a performer with whom truth or falsehood was indifferent so that his "high and lofty tumbling" should produce an effect.

Carlyle began his literary career with his "Life of Schiller," written in a comparatively pure English style. It was a style which, within the bounds of truth and sense, would have in time won him a reputation. But it brought no racketty notoriety, and he concluded to try his powers as a charlatan. His "Sartor Resartus" was the successful result of that effort. "England," he tells us, has a great population, "mostly fools." Few men had a better right to say that, for very few had more successfully demonstrated it. And so we may say Carlyle has a million of admirers, all, that much, fools; and we are not, like Judge Tourgee, "one of the fools." Finding that charlatanry won a sky-full of

public applause he extended his business in that line. From a riotous defiance of all the laws of propriety, good taste, and good sense, he proceeded to a reckless renunciation of Christianity and contemptuous outrages on Christian thought and feeling. Strange to say, these outrages received responsive applause from Christian quarters. At last, however, we seem to have come to something like a burst of this stupendous bubble. Carlyle has in these "Reminiscences" pictured himself with such repulsive truth that his worshipers finally revolt from the sight of their actual fetich. Not liking the outspoken truth of the book, they fall foul of honest Mr. Froude because he did not cover up the reality.

Our impression during long past years that Carlyle's charlatanry of style and thought was a deliberately adopted affectation we have found confirmed by the following curious confession:

> He [Edward Irving] affected the Miltonic or old English Puritan style, and strove visibly to imitate it more and more till almost the end of his career, when indeed it had become his own, and was the language he used in utmost heat of business for expressing his meaning. At this time, and for years afterward, there was something of preconceived intention visible in it, in fact of real affectation, as there could not well help being. To his example also, I suppose, *I owe something of my own poor affectations* in that matter, which are now more or less visible to me, much repented of or not.—P. 61.

Carlyle's utter abandonment of Christianity is thus recorded. And note that in this rejection not only the doctrines, but the philanthropies of Christianity, and the humanities of the age, are alike repudiated:

> This year I found that I had conquered all my skepticisms, agonizing doubtings, fearful wrestlings with the foul and vile and soul-murdering Mud-gods of my epoch; had escaped as from a worse than Tartarus, with all its Phlegethons and Stygian quagmires, and was emerging free in spirit into the eternal blue of ether, where, blessed be heaven! I have for the spiritual part ever since lived, looking down upon the welterings of my poor fellow-creatures, in such multitudes and millions still stuck in that fatal element, and have had no concern whatever in their Puseyisms, ritualisms, metaphysical controversies and cobwebberies, and no feeling of my own except honest silent pity for the serious or religious part of them, and occasional indignation, for the poor world's sake, at the frivolous secular and impious part, with their universal suffrages, their Nigger emancipations, sluggard and scoundrel Protection societies, and "unexampled prosperities" for the time being! What my pious joy and gratitude then was, let the pious soul figure. In a fine and veritable sense, I, poor, obscure, without outlook, almost without worldly hope, had become independent of the world. What was death itself, from the world, to what I had come through? I understood well what the old Christian people meant by "*conversion*," by God's infinite mercy to them. I had, in effect, gained an immense victory, and for a number of years had, in spite of nerves and chagrins, a constant inward happiness that was quite royal and supreme, in which all temporal evil was transient and insignificant, and which essentially remains with me still, though far oftener *eclipsed* and lying deeper *down* than then. Once more, thank heaven for its highest gift! I then felt, and still feel, endlessly indebted to Goethe in the business.—Pp. 142, 143.

Edward Irving's opinion of Methodism, echoed with double force from his own lips, is thus given:

I remember an excellent little portraiture of *Methodism* from him on a green knoll where he had loosely sat down. "Not a good religion, sir," said he, confidentially shaking his head in answer to my question; "far too little of spiritual conscience, far too much of temporal appetite; goes hunting and watching after its own emotions, that is, mainly its own *nervous system;* an essentially sensuous religion, depending on the body, not on the soul!" "Fit only for a gross and vulgar-minded people," I perhaps added; "a religion so-called, and the essence of it principally *cowardice* and *hunger*, terror of pain and appetite for pleasure both carried to the infinite;" to which he would sorrowfully assent in a considerable degree. My brother John, lately come home from Germany, said to me next day, "That was a pretty little *Schilderung* (portraiture) he threw off for us, that of the Methodists, wasn't it?"—Pp. 147, 148.

Chalmers pronounced Methodism to be "Christianity in earnest." What the opinions of Irving and Carlyle were, was of more consequence to themselves than to Methodism. But in regard to Irving's views we suspect that Carlyle has mistaken imagination for memory.

Cæsar: a Sketch. By James Anthony Froude, M.A. 12mo, pp. 436. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

In Mr. Froude's eloquent "sketch" the man on horseback prances into view as a hero, a patriot, a benefactor, and a martyr. Even though a usurper technically, he was the best thing as ruler of which the age was capable. Society was standing on the brink of ruin, and Cæsar's sway established that imperial unity, which, resumed under Augustus, was perpetuated in a long imperial line through that protracted death of society which awakened to a resurrection in the modern system of Christian Europe.

Mr. Froude makes out a strong case; based on the universal unparalleled corruption and ferocity of the age. When, passing the boundary lines of Italy, Roman arms had reduced to subjection that wonderful cluster of ancient civilized races that bordered the Mediterranean, her generals and deputed governors of the conquered provinces made themselves millionaires by the most stupendous robberies, and brought to Rome the rule of venality. Statesmen, courts, even the Senate itself was purchasable. The prisoners of war were transformed to slaves, and, planted in Italy, drove out the yeomanry and covered the soil with a servile population. The populace of Rome itself, the democratic voting power, was a lazy and profligate mass, supported by largesses pillaged from the provinces, and ready to enlist for pay as the retainers of the leading demagogues. The demagogues themselves were generally ready to carry their ends either by bribery

or bloodshed as the exigency demanded. Of course there was a residue of honest and honorable householders, the *boni* to whom Cicero refers as his reliance for the safety and prosperity of Rome; but, from their very position and temper, this residue was timid and unable to cope with the unscrupulous and violent political gamblers. Even Mr. Trollope, in his "Cicero," soon to be noticed, admits that Cæsar and not Cicero clearly saw the inability of the existing system to continue.

Cæsar, through the earlier half of his life, was an accomplished civilian, and the becoming a soldier seems to have been a clear afterthought. He attained the consulship, the chief magistracy, and, with a practical and patriotic statesmanship, he passed a number of laws, celebrated as the *Juliæ Leges*, that struck effectively at the evils of the times. The year after his consulship he took to the camp, and occupied ten heroic years in bringing to subjection and order the northern tribal nations who had repeatedly menaced Rome with ruin. On his return he did his best to compromise with the Senate and Pompey. His persistent offers of peace, sustained by the efforts of Cicero, were persistently rejected by Pompey. Both Froude and Trollope agree that Pompey was an incompetent man, raised by a series of accidents to a position above his level. When Cæsar came across the Rubicon Pompey seemed paralyzed, and yet would accept no terms. He neither allowed peace nor efficiently prepared for war. The agonized Cicero looked on in dismay, seeing that Pompey had the right side but was securing its overthrow. The battle of Pharsalia was memorable, not as the greatest contest of the war, but as the field where a large number of the senatorial oligarchy were slain. That battle swept off the aristocracy of Rome very much as the Wars of the Roses swept the old Norman nobility of England, and as the French Revolution abolished the feudalism of France.

Cæsar then assumed authority with the exercise of the most enlightened statesmanship. Unlike the Mariuses and Syllas of former unforgotten days, he prosecuted no massacres or proscriptions. He walked the streets without arms or guards. So great had been his clemency, especially to Marcus Marcellus, that Cicero, in open Senate, declared to Cæsar that if any assault was made upon him the whole Senate would rush to his defense. Cæsar was preparing to start in a few days for the field to fight for the unity of the empire, when the converging dagger-points of thirty senatorial conspirators closed a life which, no doubt, would have been spent for the good of Rome.

Bad as "the man on horseback" intrinsically is, he may be the only, and therefore the justifiable, remedy for an anarchical age. Had Alexander the Great lived to accomplish his great plans for general improvement, despotic as he was, he would have been a benefactor of the race, advancing the progress of human civilization by several rapid degrees. Charlemagne's sword, reducing the barbarians of central Europe to peace, laid the foundations for the unity of Christendom. For us, of these United States, the only way of escaping the imperial rider is not by school-boy declamations against his character, but by cultivating a general intelligence, a pure political morality, and a universal unsectional peace, brotherhood, and unity. Sectional strife, especially over our Presidential elections, will infallibly call out the American Cæsar.

The Life of Cicero. By ANTHONY TROLLOPE. In two volumes. Small 12mo., pp. 347, 346. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

Mr. Trollope's biography of the great orator is a labor of love. He is fully impressed with the wonderful blend of majesty and beauty in the character of his hero, and defends him in detail, and some will say even with some special pleading, against detractions.

In judging of Cicero in comparison with the other Romans of his day very much the same error occurs as is often committed in judging the Christian in comparison with the worldling; the standard is imperceptibly changed, and the worse is surreptitiously made the better man. The worldling is judged by the average worldly standard and the Christian by the ideal of Christianity. Hence in one positive immoralities are held as becoming, and the slightest foibles and short-comings are criminalities in the other. Cicero was historically the purest public man of his day; and hence he is tried by a standard of purity which would be absurd as a test of Cæsar or even Cato or Brutus. He wrote on morals, and hence he is required to be his own moral philosophy jumped incarnate out of its cover. His writings have been read by even modern thinkers with a malign hypercriticism; and, as Mr. Trollope well shows, have been subjected to flagrant misconstructions—specially so by Mr. Froude—to convict him of crime. As a whole, Mr. Trollope successfully shows that after correcting all calumnious charges and deducting for all short-comings and foibles, we have a most magnificent remainder, one of the noblest characters of antiquity, one of the truest pre-Christian Christians of the classic ages.

In estimating the character of Cicero what we have said in our notice of Froude's Cæsar comes to the front. The *boni* were the remnant of substantial citizens, uncorrupted by the incoming flood of depravity after Rome's conquest of Asia. For public safety and prosperity they looked to the restoration of private honesty and public patriotism. To them the old historic Senate was the very image of eternity, their sole safety amid vicissitudes. They dreaded all revolution, whether from incendiaries, like Catiline, or humane statesmanly despots, like Cæsar. As adherents of the Senate they have been called the aristocracy, but they might as well be called the democracy, for that name would be dishonored by applying it to the salable voting rabble of Rome, even more than when labeled upon the voting slums of New York. Of this class, and relying on it for support, the type and usually the head was Cicero.

The difficulty was that in these unscrupulous times the *boni* were necessarily timid and unpractical. The very problem before them was to "bell the cat," nay, to tame the tiger. Their very quietude of character victimized them. And it was impossible, amid the turbulent leaders of the day, to hold a supreme position as Cicero aspired, without an expert readiness to handle an army. He was an elegant porcelain vase rolling amid a variety of tumbling iron kettles, obliged to deflect his course or meet a collision and suffer a crash. He might, like Atticus, lead a life of quiet integrity, and let the world accomplish its own ruin according to programme; he might, like Hortensius, take first place in the first rank of advocates; he might, like Horace, turn to elegant literature; but if he must be a ruling statesman without being military commander, he *must* now and then veer his course, flatter a fool, or defend a knave. That far did Cicero temporize and trim. So far did he sink below the pure ideal. Very well; make subtraction, and see what a magnificent treasure of character remains. We sympathize with Mr. Trollope entirely in enjoying and magnifying this treasure; and we, in fact, object to our hero's being so perpetually put upon his defense.

In all the annals of forensic history was there ever a greater triumph, measured by *morale*, courage, and ability, than Cicero's prosecution of Verres? In boldly calling Verres to account he towered above the political level of his day. He had a bribed Senate for a court, Hortensius for an opposing advocate, and a most powerful corruptionist for a defendant. Yet so splendid

and heroic was his bullyism, that by the notoriety which his ability could give to the venality of the court before the Roman people, he cowed the Senate into rectitude, silenced the eloquent Hortensius, and drove the audacious Verres out of court. The speeches he prepared were thence not delivered but published; and they remain on record to-day, both as monuments of masterly ability, and as historic exhibition of the stupendous iniquities which the average Roman proconsul could commit in the province subjected to his arbitrary rule.

Why is it that that wonderful piece of pre-Christian Christianity, the "Somnium Scipionis," is so little brought out by scholars at the present day? Years ago we wrote a translation of it and published it in a Western periodical, but irrecoverably lost it. It was, doubtless, no great loss, since being done without aids save from the mere text, it was probably very imperfect. But why is it not edited and published as part of the curriculum? We would open the pages of our Quarterly to a well-prepared and annotated translation.

First Decade of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church: with Sketches of its Missionaries. By MARY SPARKES WHEELER. With an Introduction by Bishop J. F. HURST, D.D. 12mo, pp. 346. New York: Phillips & Hunt; Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1881.

Mrs. Wheeler has presented us a gem of a book. The first decade of this Society is full of interest in itself and full of promise of a rich future. This Society, first proposed by a returned lady missionary, was started in 1869, amid inauspicious omens, with feeble beginnings and tremulous faith. It was grounded on the fact that in the East women are only accessible to women, and that consequently there must be a corps of women missionaries, with the further inference that women were the most proper agents to send them. Incorporation with the general Missionary Society was positively, persistently, and, we think, wisely declined, while harmony with it was earnestly desired. The Society aspired to and obtained the authorization of the General Conference. Its first missionary was appointed before the funds were raised, and, rather than fail of means for her support, it was bravely proposed by the ladies that they would walk the streets of Boston in calico to save the funds.

Mrs. Wheeler gives the roll and biographical sketches of female missionaries already sent to Asia by her Society. They are elect ladies. The deep experiences, alike yet varying, of each

and all, wonderfully evince that the whole is a divine movement, a sweet awakening from the blessed Spirit. That in each secret heart an inspiration should be moving, calling for a life consecration to the mission work, simultaneously with each other, and with the spirit that organized the work, seems to be a divinely concerted plan. The young mind may indeed be stimulated by a certain romance of missionary life; but that glamour soon disappears, either when the time of action arrives, or when the repulsive scenes of heathen life, and the weary details of mission duty, are really reached. Not so with these elect. Their hearts are there; the sight of dying heathenism deepens their sympathy, and "love esteems no office mean." "Don't go home," said Miss Thoburn to her visiting friend Mrs. Chandler, of Baltimore, "to excite sympathy for me. I am happy in my work. I am busy here, and *we all feel so.* Our work lies here, and when sickness comes, and we turn our faces homeward, *we leave our hearts behind.*" Nearing the coast of Asia, Miss Sigourney Trask writes: "The actual work of my life is soon to begin. I am *so* glad it is at hand. I do believe every feeling, faculty, and possibility of my nature is consecrated a living—I do not like to say sacrifice—a living energy to accomplish the mission God has given me among the Chinese." 'Bound in spirit,' said Paul; under bonds of the Spirit I go. This bondage is my liberty, the bonds are my joy and strength. I am grateful, but a *life*, not words, must show the gratitude that makes my spirit sing." It was no ordinary spirit that could so "sing," and no ordinary pen that could so record the spirit's song. And so says the well-remembered daughter of David Dallas Lore: "My heart has been enlarged since reaching India. I have loved people always, ever so many, but now it seems as if *I truly love souls.*" Surely these elect ladies are priceless gems which America gives to Asia. Mrs. Wheeler has nobly done her work as historiographer of the first decade of her beloved Society. May she live to record another more triumphant decade!

The Story of the United States Navy. For Boys. By BENSON J. LOSSING, LL.D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

This work was prepared at the suggestion of Captain S. B. Luce, of the U. S. N., the commander of the training ship "Minnesota." The other training ships in the service are the "Constellation," "Saratoga," "Portsmouth," and "St. Louis." Last year there

were 1,152 boys under instruction, ranging from thirteen to eighteen years of age. The instruction is intended to prepare boys for sailors in the navy, and elevate the standard of naval life. The closing chapter of the book contains a full account of the system of training schools in Great Britain and this country. The book has been prepared with special reference to the class of boys entering the training ships. It is admirably adapted to persons of the required age, and an excellent book to place in the hands of boys who are tempted to read blood-and-thunder stories published in our flash papers and dime novels. Any thing which will wean our youth from these flesh-pots should be hailed by every parent.

The triumphs of American seamanship during the Revolutionary struggle over the great maritime power of Europe are narrated with thrilling interest. The colonial navy, like the patriot army, was extemporized. During the war for independence, or between 1775 and 1783, the United States had thirty-six vessels of war afloat, of which number only two survived the struggle. The glorious achievements of John Paul Jones and others furnish a brilliant page in our early history. Six hundred and fifty prizes, it is said, were taken into port besides those ransomed and destroyed. The pressure of the English commercial class had a powerful influence in bringing about the acknowledgment of our independence. The war of 1812, for the "freedom of the seas," was also signalized by grand naval achievements, which are described most graphically. The words of the dying officer, "Don't give up the ship!" which became the battle-cry of the young navy, cannot fail to thrill our American youth with patriotic aspirations. While the achievements of the War for the Union are fresh in the minds of the sires, they have become history to the sons. The great naval engagements are vividly pictured. We could wish that more books of this class were placed within the reach of our youth, so as to wean them from the Satanic literature that heroizes thieves and pirates.

The Life of George the Fourth: including his Letters and Opinions, with a View of the Men, Manners, and Politics of his Reign. By PERCY FITZGERALD, M.A., F.S.A. Illustrated. Large 12mo, pp. 921. New York: Harper & Brothers.

We think it was the first Alexander of Russia who said, "God must be merciful to kings, for they have great temptations." And besides, they are judged also by human history, which, growingly democratic, is growingly severe. Mr. Fitzgerald's

book is a sharp admonitory to the young princes of England how their corpses may be given over to biographic dissection, and hence how important it is to preserve a proper symmetry of character. But the Harpers' critic, we think, is seduced by the brilliancy of an antithesis to historic exaggeration when he tells us that George the Fourth was not only "the first gentleman," but also "the first rascal," in Europe. He was simply a dissolute gentleman about town, who continued, in spite of a ruinous dissipation, running through the whole round of drinking, whoring, gambling, racing, etc., to still maintain a social courtesy in life. He was kindly in feeling, honorable except when pushed by a hard exigency into a lie or a fraud, constant in heart, though not in conduct, to the victim of a morganatic marriage. He varied with his father, and our historian divides the blame equally between the two. He was married by State machinery to a disgusting German woman of dubious chastity, and sought for a divorce, to which, but for his own infidelities, he was probably quite justly entitled. We think there are hundreds, and, we fear, thousands, of as great rascals in New York city to-day. As a sovereign, George meant to be just, ruling as a constitutional king over his own realm, and cultivating justice and peace toward foreign nations. His vices were those of an impulsive young man, unchecked by authority, surrounded by seductions, with ample means of sensual gratification, with all his slightest aberrations conspicuous to the public gaze and exposed to the glaring light of history. He had graceful manners, a prompt wit, a good share of talent, a taste for art, an enthusiasm for building, and not one tendency to becoming a tyrant or a disturber of the peace of Europe. Will historians and critics allow us to pity while we condemn? What might, alas, have become of ourself had we been born a prince! Happily we are only an editor, and thereby entitled to the quasi-royal *we*.

Kemper County Vindicated, and a Peep at Radical Rule in Mississippi. By James D. Lynch, author of poems, "Robert E. Lee; or, Nerves in the South," "The Ku-klux Tribunal," etc. 12mo, pp. 416. New York: E. J. Hale & Son. 1879.

In a late Quarterly we referred to the Chisholm murder as a political crime, and a Mississippi friend sent us this book in disproof that it was either a crime or a political act. The book, as the very title shows, is written in an intensely partisan style. It opens with statements which we think historically untrue. Its style is highly rhetorical, yet it is written with a graceful ease.

It appears from a New York press heretofore unknown to us, neatly and correctly printed on poor material, disfigured with caricature cuts, and we have never seen it heretofore noticed by any of our periodicals. Our casual allusion to this man-slaughter was, of course, under assumption of its notorious truth, without any preceding critical or judicial investigation. We have neither the materials nor time for such an investigation. We, however, in fairness to Kemper County, record the fact that the killing of Chisholm is professedly proved to have been the destruction of a villain in a non-political quarrel.

Politics, Law, and General Morals.

Our Brother in Black: His Freedom and his Future. By Atticus Haygood, D.D., President of Emory College, Oxford, Georgia. 12mo, pp. 252. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1881.

The President of Emory College has given us what may perhaps be called an epochal book. At least it serves to mark, and aids to initiate, the transition to a better understanding between the two sections and the two parties in a dispute of a century in length. Will the terrible wound given to our free republic by the introduction of slavery at last be healed? It will be accomplished by the spirit and style of discussion, commenced so far as the South is concerned, by this book.

Dr. Haygood is, we are glad to say, a true Southerner. It is a bold, frank, free-spoken, yet candid and liberal Southerner whom we wish to hear, and he now, almost for the first time, speaks. He can see that even his beloved South can err, and he often gives a sharp retaliatory hit at the North. But we must tell him that he has not rebuked the North half as sharply as our "Quarterly" has done through all these past years. More fully than he have we chided our Northern "Pharisaism." We have denied repeatedly that emancipation took place as a great moral victory. We have shown how remarkably the warmth of our antagonism, beginning from Boston and ending in Charleston, coincided with latitudes and the degrees of the thermometer. The human nature of the North and the South, overlooking surface differences, is the same. There is a sort of truth in the maxim, "One man is as good as another, and a little better;" and we may add conversely, one man is as bad as another, and a little worse. When, therefore, Dr. H. lays the *flagellum* sharply on

the faults and vices of the North, with a serenely benevolent motive, we say, again and again, "Lay on, Macduff!" If you can whip us out of our wickednesses we will not even object to your "Pharisaism."

In his first four chapters Dr. H. surveys the negro population. It is more than six millions, is genial, lax, yet inclined to industry and susceptible of elevation. "It is here to stay," and cannot, as a whole, be colonized; nay, there are signs of a providence in their location as a great solution of the problem. In a few chapters more he contemplates the facts of their emancipation and enfranchisement. He claims that there is a "time element" fairly required for the South to come fully right, reminding us how recently the North had her anti-abolition riots and her demolition of negro schools. He passes then in his later chapters to the happy modes of solution of the great problem in the grand work of schools and Churches now going on, and hopes that the elevation of the American African will overflow to the regeneration of African African.

There are some points on which we take friendly issue with our author. We cheerfully agree with him that as slavery is dead we need not continue to fight over its grave or over its ghost. Our "Quarterly" said immediately at the close of the war, "Now let us, North and South, shake hands over the grave of buried slavery, and unite in elevating the freedman to manhood." But Dr. H. seems to us to impose too complete a silence upon us. So great an event as the existence and downfall of American slavery must be historically and morally discussed. Napoleon is "dead;" but whole libraries of history are pouring forth upon his life and character. Especially at the present time a discussion has arisen as to the part taken by the evangelical Churches in the abolition of slavery. Infidelity is reiterating the taunt that the Churches were silent against a great sin, and they are now rendering answer. These injunctions to silence we defied when slavery was powerful with Lynch Law in her hands; we are not likely to obey them now when that dark power has become one of the phantasms of history. Nor can we be silent when we behold the spirit of slavery still alive and acting now, North or South. But so far as concerns calling it up as a reproach upon men who are like Dr. H. seeking the time solution of the problem of humanity, we rejoice to impose silence upon our lip and pen. We give them our hearty right hand, and our purpose is to seek the best present and future good for all.

We must now touch a still more delicate point, and we assure all concerned we touch it not to reproach, but to show where the fault lies, and has lain in the past, in order to aid in bringing matters right. On page 95 Dr. H. maintains that the balance of suspicions and bad tempers between North and South has been about even. "Neither side has shown any great superiority of temper or penetration." Now we call Dr. Haygood's attention, for instance, to the behavior since the war of our two Methodisms. Every offer of conciliation, fraternity, reunion, has come from the North, repeatedly repelled by the South. Immediately at the close of the war the two New York Conferences sent their greetings to the Southern General Conference and were cavalierly treated. Our Bishops called a fraternal council with the Southern Bishops and were cavalierly treated. Bishop Janes and Dr. Harris went as delegates to the Southern General Conference and were cavalierly treated. And whenever a luckless Northerner spoke of "reunion," he was rapped over the knuckles and told that talk about "reunion" did not "tend to fraternity." Slowly and reluctantly the Southern General Conference consented to fraternity. All the honor of Christian fraternal advances seems to rest with the North. Again, the North sent her teachers and preachers south to do the work which scarce a man, before Dr. Haygood, has ever acknowledged to be a great philanthropic work. And this coldness was not the *result* of the fanatical overdo on the part of our missionary teachers, as Dr. H. desires to believe; it was antecedent. Unanimously did our brethren of the Church South, while doing nothing themselves, proclaim, through their press, that nothing should be done by others. Even the lamented Duncan, we think it was, as editor of the "Richmond Advocate," ridiculed the northern "school-marms," shamefully charged them with "ignorance," and declared that the North did not "understand the negro," and must have nothing to do with his education.

And turning to secular life we might show how in the North, since the war, while a Southerner is always received with unqualified cordiality, the South, and the Southern press, assumes, down to the latest dates, to prescribe on what conditions a Northerner may immigrate south; and under all the circumlocutions in which these conditions are phrased, is concealed the one absolute condition that he must vote the democratic ticket, or at least be not an active republican, and so "make trouble."

We might recall the fact that in the war the North was at first

beaten just because, while the South was arming, the North not expecting, was entirely unprepared for war. We might from before the war rehearse the well-known fact that the writer of these lines, or any other antislavery man, even in time of peace, could not have safely stood in the editorial office of Dr. Summers. Nay, to go back to the origin, when the South made up her mind to slavery she made up her mind to danger, suspicion, secession, and ultimate convulsion. She was her own nihilist; she placed the bomb and the volcano beneath her own feet. That state of "suspicion" she is now, we believe, fast recovering; and while we fully allow for a "time element," we believe that the briefer the "time" the earlier the return to peace and prosperity.

As offset to all these points Dr. H. will doubtless oppose the oppressions suffered by the South under "the carpet-baggers." "Carpet-bag government" in all our converse and correspondence with Southern friends we find to be the sore spot on the sensorium of memory. Now we have no difficulty in assuring them that the good people of the North, including the great body of honorable republicans, never intended any oppression by government agents, or any imposition of restrictions not needed for the safe reconstruction of our Republic in the South. For any tyranny proper we have no apology to offer. For any repressive force, not necessary to secure peace and insure loyalty, we have no approval. And now, having affirmed thus much, we must ask Dr. H. and others to put themselves into a fair historic position and spirit, and answer, conscientiously, a question or two. Was there ever in all the history of nations so great a rebellion—as our government had a legal right to view the secession—put down with so terrible an expenditure of blood and treasure, and yet finally closed up with so little penal bloodshed or infliction of any kind? Did ever in all history a government so soon remove all disabilities, and even put the rebel leaders in the councils of the nation? Did ever a great rebel section be put by the conquerors so soon into a possibility of actually themselves attaining control of the government itself? A true answer to these questions would, we humbly think, compel Dr. H. to say that so far from behaving badly, the magnanimity of the North is without a historical parallel.

In his bold and truthful sermon, "The New South," Dr. Haygood declares, if we rightly recollect, (we have not the copy at hand,) that the present condition of the South is in every material respect better than it was before the war. That is, both the

war and the carpet-bag did not keep the South as wretched as it was under the old oligarchy. That is, the carpet-baggers were not as repressive a tyranny as the slave-holders. But it was the South that inflicted the slave-power, the North the carpet-bag; and so the North has not been as oppressive upon the South—war, carpet-bag, and all—as the South has been upon herself.

On page 82 Dr. Haygood anticipates a union of the Southern black and white voters, and warns the North of some dread damage from the combination. It is a strangely Bourbon paragraph. For, *first*, such union would produce nothing more than we have already had, a "solid South." Whether that solidity came from crushing, cheating, or absorbing the colored voter, or all together, it would not increase the Southern electoral vote, and very little the Congressional representation. But, *second*, Dr. Haygood's mind in the passage seems to contemplate a permanent hostile sectionalism. It is a South against a North, in which the South will do some unknown damage to the North, at which the North had better tremble. We do not turn pale thereat. Yet we prefer a cessation of that execrable antithesis. We prefer to repeat the maxim, which we have twice or thrice propounded, and which we would like to stereotype into a proverb, and to which we invite the concurrence of Dr. Haygood and all other patriotic Southerners, that *there shall be no more antagonism, political or otherwise, between North and South than now exists between East and West.*

According to the best of our observation the good men of the South have recovered from the demoralizations of the war, and are awake and bravely active in the cause of temperance, education, law, and order. We have noted the movements in various Legislatures against intemperance and the carrying concealed weapons with pleasure. Statistics seem to show a most alarming amount of homicide in that section, which we anticipate will soon be greatly diminished. What is wanted is an increase of sympathy and union between the good men of North and South in behalf of social and national improvement. Especially is this co-operation needed in raising our politics to a higher moral plane. We need, as Dr. Haygood has well proclaimed, "to carry our religion into our politics," and to render the political morals of all parties purer and less fiercely partisan. We need to be Christian and conscientious in caucus and at the polls. We need, as it is sometimes said here in the North, to "vote as we pray." And this union is coming. North and South are fusing and blending, in railroad communications, in interchange of immense

annual visitations southward in winter and northward in summer, in business relations, and in Christian fraternity. And our experience is that when Southerners and Northerners cordially meet they see good reason to respect and love each other. Our worst antagonisms come from the sectional politicians; and the politicians are sectional because they expect to gain success by creating, appealing to, and riding, the local prejudice and passion. Let our good men spoil their game by scouting such passions and driving such prejudices out of the popular mind.

Dr. Haygood has nobly commenced this work in a style that smacks of independence and originality. He is in the prime of strength and manhood, and we augur that a noble future lies before him. It is a symbol of union that his book is issued from the publishing houses of both Northern and Southern Methodism. We wish we could order a million copies for each section.

Literature and Fiction.

Harper's Cyclopædia of British and American Poetry. Edited by EPES SARGENT. 8vo, pp. 958. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

Cyclopædia of Poetry. Second Series. Embracing Poems Descriptive of the Scenes, Incidents, Persons, and Places of the Bible. Also Indexes to Foster's Cyclopædias. By Rev. ELON FOSTER, D.D. 8vo, pp. 748. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co. 1881.

There must be a great demand for English Anthologies which has to be met with such magnificent supplies as these two tall and corpulent octavos.

It takes nearly thirty octavo pages to furnish the index of Mr. Sargent's work, embracing authors' names and titles of pieces. What strikes us at a glance is the fact that while rich selections are made from the greatest masters of song, many of the brief master strokes here presented are from hands that never furnished but a performance or two. Mr. Sargent has arrested the fugitives and fixed them in no "durance vile." Of this he is aware, and he notes in his Preface how poets have multiplied during the present century. Poets generate poets, attuning the minds of their readers into a productive power. And the growing mass of poetry swells, like a coral continent, without limits.

Dr. Foster's volume complements the work of Mr. Sargent. While the latter ranges through the varied world of secular poetic literature, not indeed excluding the sacred, the former limits himself to the poetry inspired by the scenes, events, and

characters of the Bible. Our holy book is one great poem; for the ideality of religion is at once truth and poetry. The volume consists of selections from not only the "Sacred Melodies" of Byron and Moore, who have furnished some of the finest strains in this department, but from Milman, Montgomery, Browning, Longfellow; and, nearer home, specimens not unworthy of such a place, by George Lansing Taylor, Dwight Williams, and others. About one third of the volume consists of indexes to the compiler's Cyclopædias of prose and poetic selections, enabling the possessor to quickly put his finger upon any desired topic, passage, or author's name.

Index to Harper's New Monthly Magazine. Alphabetical, Analytical, and Classified. Vols. 1 to 60 inclusive, from June, 1850, to June, 1880. Compiled by CHARLES A. DURFEE. 8vo, pp. 721. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

Sixty volumes and thirty years of existence are themselves indices of eminent success for a magazine. The pecuniary results are not stated, but of their rich magnitude there is of course no doubt. An examination of the contents reveals the fact that the success has been honorably won by furnishing a vast volume of literature, of a *solid* as well as an attractive character, instructive to the scholar and the statesman, while gaining the attention of the million. By a hasty count we find of fiction, sixteen index pages; of poetry, sixteen pages; of history of current events and general history, fifty-five pages; of science, thirty-four pages. While we have sometimes wished that the funny chapter at the end were a little chastened, we must say that this big octavo indices a periodical without a rival in its class.

Political Eloquence in Greece. Demosthenes: With Extracts from his Orations, and a Critical Discussion of the "Trial on the Crown." By L. BRÉDIF, former Member of the Superior Normal School of France, Doctor in the Faculty of Letters at Toulouse, Rector of the Chamberg Academy, University of France, etc. Translated by M. J. MACMAHON, A.M. 8vo, pp. 510. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1881. Price $3.

We have never read a monograph on ancient politics with more zest than the present volume. Whatever high classical criticism may decide as to the profound accuracy of the author's views there is no doubt of his ability to give a fresh life to the scenes and men of the past. This arises from his keen insight into the history with a most modern pair of eyes, and a style of epigram and point, and pictorial vividness. The work is within the author's specialty as professor and devoted student of Demosthenes and Athenian politics for more than twenty years.

Foreign Theological Publications.

Gebhardt, Oscar v., und Adolf Harnack, Evangeliorum Codex Graecui purpureus Rossanensis. Litteris argenteis sexto ut videtur saeculo scriptus picturisque ornatus. Seine Entdeckung, sein wissenschaftlicher und künstlerischer Werth. Mit two facsim. Schrifttafeln (in Silberdr.) und (17) lith. Umrisszeichnungen. Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient. 1880.

This codex was accidentally discovered last year by the above-named gentlemen while traveling in Italy for purposes of study. They had learned from Lagarde's edition of "Hippolytus" that it was reported in the sixteenth century that manuscripts of Hippolytus, Cyrillus of Jerusalem, and Dionysius Alexandrinus were preserved in S. Maria de lo Patire, an old cloister in or near Rossano, in Calabria.

They accordingly visited Rossano, eager to find and examine the said manuscripts for themselves, but only to be disappointed, neither cloister nor any trace thereof any longer remaining. They were then conducted to the residence of the Archbishop of Rossano, where, upon further inquiry, they were shown an old work, which, it is said, neither the archbishop nor any one of his forty-eight learned subordinates could read, not even determine so much as the language in which it was written. Messrs. Gebhardt and Harnack soon deciphered it to be an old codex containing the Gospel of Matthew complete, and all of Mark, excepting the last verses of the last chapter, (xvi, 14, seq.) It is supposed to have contained originally all four Gospels. It is written in beautiful silvered uncial characters, on fine purple-colored parchment, and is the only Greek codex of the Gospels hitherto known on such parchment, excepting the very fragmentary Codex N, to which it is closely related. In point of text it is preceded by Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, and ranks with AΔI, but is more like Cod. D and *Itala*.

It consists of one hundred and eighty-eight leaves, 26 by 30.7 centimeters. The text is in double columns of twenty lines each. The words are written without accents, and are not separated. On the margin are distinctly marked the Canons of Eusebius. On eight of the leaves are finely painted representations of scenes, mostly taken from the history of the sufferings of Christ, in style resembling those of the Vienna Genesis Codex, and representing the transition period from ancient classical painting to that of Byzantine painting.

The present publication is simply a preliminary report upon this interesting discovery. The editors hope to give later a

complete description of the nature and condition of the manuscript and of the painting. Two plates, in silver type, on purple ground, accompany the work and present to the eye exact specimens of the text. It is also furnished with seventeen lithographed sketches of the miniatures. Through these, and the plates, one gets a very good impression of the appearance and age of the manuscript, and also of the character and style of the painting.

Paleographically considered, this codex may almost certainly be assigned to the sixth century, and although it may not be, for purposes of text criticism, of pre-eminent value, it is certainly a very important contribution to the history of Christian painting.

Miscellaneous.

Sermons to Students and Thoughtful Persons. By LLEWELYN D. BEVAN, LL.B., D.D. 12mo, pp. 209. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1881.

Master Missionaries. Chapters in Pioneer Effort throughout the World. By ALEXANDER HAY JAPP, LL.D. 12mo, pp. 398. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1881.

Missionary Concerts for the Sunday-school. A Collection of Declamations, Select Readings, and Dialogues. Compiled by Rev. W. T. SMITH. 16mo, pp. 267. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. New York: Phillips & Hunt. 1881.

The Palace Beautiful; or, Sermons to Children. By WILLIAM WILBERFORCE NEWTON. 16mo, pp. 348. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1881.

A Key to the Apocalypse; or, Revelation of Jesus Christ to St. John in the Isle of Patmos. By Rev. ALFRED BRUNSON, A.M., D.D. 16mo, pp. 215. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. New York: Phillips & Hunt. 1881.

Leaders of Men. A Book of Biographies specially written for Youth. By H. A. PAGE. 12mo, pp. 398. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1881.

Wise Words and Loving Deeds. A Book of Biographies for Girls. By E. CONDER GRAY. 16mo, pp. 415. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1881.

Sir William Herschel; His Life and Works. By EDWARD S. HOLDEN. 12mo, pp. 238. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1881.

English Men of Letters. Edited by JOHN MORLEY: *Wordsworth.* By F. W. H. MYERS. 12mo, pp. 182. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

Anecdotes of Public Men. By JOHN W. FORNEY. Vol. II. 12mo, pp. 437. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

Memoirs of Prince Metternich. 1773–1815. Edited by PRINCE RICHARD METTERNICH. The Papers classified and arranged by M. A. de Klinkomström. Translated by Mrs. ALEXANDER NAPIER. 12mo. Vol. I, pp. 728. Vol. II, 1815–1829, pp. 942. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

Chautauqua Library of English History and Literature. Vol. II. *The Period of the Early Plantagenets.* 12mo, pp. 124. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1881.

The Story of Helen Troy. By the Author of "Golden Rod," "An Idyl of Mt. Desert." 16mo, pp. 202. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

Boys and Girls Playing, and Other Addresses to Children. By the Right Rev. JOHN CHARLES RYLE, D.D. 16mo, pp. 193. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1881.

Who was Paul Grayson? By JOHN HABBERTON. Illustrated. Square 16mo, pp. 169. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

The Lyceum Library, No. 1. The Two Kings; The White Rose of England; Five Stages in the Life of a Great Man; A Queen Who was Not a Queen. Paper cover. 8vo, pp. 44. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1881.

Proceedings of the New England Methodist Historical Society at the First Annual Meeting, January 17, 1881. Paper. 8vo., pp. 24. Boston: Society's Rooms, 36 Bromfield-street. 1881.

Sixty-Fourth Annual Report of the American Colonization Society. With the Minutes of the Annual Meeting and of the Board of Directors. January 18, 19, 1881. Paper. 8vo, pp. 28. Washington: Colonization Building, 450 Pennsylvania Avenue.

The Hour for Africa. An Address Delivered before the American Colonization Society. By JOHN L. WITHROW, D.D. Paper. Pp. 12. Washington: Colonization Building. 1881.

Ingersollism Brought Face to Face with Christianity. Two Sermons Preached by J. H. CALDWELL, D.D. Paper. Pp. 47. Wilmington, Del.: The James & Webb Printing and Stationery Co. 1881.

The Opening of a World. Paper. Pp. 16. Washington: Thomas M'Gill & Co. 1881.

The Mountain Movers; Or, A Criticism of So-called Modern Miracles in Answer to the Prayer of Faith. By STEPHEN H. TYNG, Jun., D.D. Paper. 16mo, pp. 32. New York: The People's Pulpit Publishing Co. 1880.

Baptism. By J. DITZLER, D.D. 12mo, pp. 364. Louisville, Ky.: John P. Morton & Co. 1880.

Affinity no Bar to Marriage. By JOHN B. GALE. Paper. 8vo, pp. 77. Troy, N. Y.: William H. Young. 1881.

FRANKLIN SQUARE LIBRARY: *The Life of George the Fourth;* Including His Letters and Opinions, with a View of the Men, Manners, and Politics of his Reign. By PERCY FITZGERALD, M.A., F.S.A. In Two Parts. Part II, pp. 99.—*Memoirs of Prince Metternich.* Edited by PRINCE RICHARD METTERNICH. In Four Parts. Part II, 1773–1815, pp. 92. Part III, 1815–1829, pp. 101. Part IV, 1815–1829, pp. 94.—*From Exile.* By JAMES PAYN. Pp. 69—*Beside the River.* By Katharine S. Macquoid. Pp. 68.—*The Miller's Daughter.* By ANNE BEALE. Pp. 65.—*The Chaplain of the Fleet.* By WALTER BESANT and JAMES RICE. Pp. 81. Paper, 4to. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

Modern Anglican Theology. Chapters on Coleridge, Hare, Maurice, Kingsley, and Jowett, and on the Doctrine of Sacrifice and Atonement. Third Edition, Revised. To which is Prefixed a Memoir of Canon Kingsley, with Personal Reminiscences. By Rev. JAMES H. RIGG, D.D., Author of "Essays for the Times," etc. 12mo, pp. 552. London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 2 Castle-street, City Road; and 66 Paternoster Row.

Discourses and Addresses on Leading Truths in Religion and Philosophy. By Rev. JAMES H. RIGG, D.D., Author of "Modern Anglican Theology," "Essays for the Times," "National Education," "The Living Wesley," "The Churchmanship of John Wesley," etc., etc. 8vo, pp. 454. London: Published for the Author, Wesleyan Conference Office, 2 Castle-street, City Road; sold at 66 Paternoster Row, and Wesleyan Sunday-School Union, 2 Ludgate Circus Buildings. 1880.

Notice of Dr. Rigg's volumes will appear in our next Quarterly.

The American Conflict. A Household Story. Narrated in three volumes. 12mo, pp. 273, 279, 194. New York: Phillips & Hunt.

Literary Style and Other Essays. By WILLIAM MATTHEWS, LL.D. Author of "Getting On in the World," "Words: Their Use and Abuse," "Oratory and Orations," etc., etc. 12mo, pp. 345. Chicago: L. C. Riggs & Co. 1881.

The Chinese: Their Education, Philosophy, and Letters. By W. A. P. MARTIN, D.D., LL.D., President of the Tungwen College, Pekin. 12mo, pp. 319. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

The chapter on the Chinese *Renaissance* is the best in this excellent series of chapters.

Platonism versus *Christianity.* The Question of Immortality Historically Considered, with Special Reference to the Apostasy of the Christian Church. To which is Annexed an Essay on the Unity of Man. By J. H. PETTINGELL, A.M., a Congregational Minister, etc. 12mo, pp. 97. Philadelphia: The Bible Banner Association; J. D. Brown, Agent. 1881.

Christian Institutions. Essays on Ecclesiastical Subjects. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster. Author of "History of the Jewish Church," "Life of Dr. Arnold," "Sinai and Palestine," etc. 12mo, pp. 322. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881. (Stereotyped and printed by S. W. Green's Son.)

Fresh and independent, if not always unquestionable.

At the Threshold. Familiar Talks with Young Christians Concerning Doctrines and Duties. By Rev. Ross C. HOUGHTON, D.D. Author of "Women of the Orient," etc. 12mo, pp. 133. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. New York: Phillips & Hunt. 1881.

An admirable book for the beginner in Christian and Church life.

Madame De Staël. A Study of her Life and Times. The First Revolution and the First Empire. By ABEL STEVENS, LL.D. In two volumes. 12mo, pp. 367. Vol. II, pp. 373. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

To be noticed in our next Quarterly.

Bible Terminology Relative to the Future Life. An Inquiry into the Meaning of the Principal Scriptural Terms Touching the Nature and Destiny of Man; namely, Soul, Spirit, Life, Death, Hell, the Second Death, Punishment, Everlasting Destruction, the Life Everlasting, Eternal; the Great Salvation, the Unspeakable Gift, Discarded Scriptural Terms. By J. H. PETTINGELL, A.M., a Congregational Minister, etc. 12mo, pp. 368. Philadelphia: The Bible Banner Association. J. D. Brown, Agent. 1881.

Hunting Adventures on Land and Sea. The Young Nimrods in North America. A Book for Boys. By THOMAS W. KNOX, Author of "The Boy Travelers in the Far East, Japan and China." "The Boy Travelers in the Far East, Siam and Java," etc. Copiously Illustrated. 8vo, pp. 299. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

A Short History of the Colonies in America. By HENRY CABOT LODGE. 8vo, pp. 360. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

The History of a Mountain. By ELISÉE RECLUS. Translated from the French by BERTHA NESS and JOHN LILLIE. Illustrated by L. Bennett. 12mo, pp. 195. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

Methodist Quarterly Review.

OCTOBER, 1881.

Art. I.—HINDU ECLECTICISM.

One of the trials incident to missionary life in a semi-civilized country like India has scarcely had due prominence given it. The Indian missionary lives, like his brother worker in less civilized heathen lands, in what the late good Bishop Thomson very appropriately called "a moral pest-house;" and he has difficulties of a general character, arising out of human nature, current systems of belief, defective intellectual culture, a low type of morality, and various other sources, to grapple with. But he has some peculiar trials, and these begin as soon as he begins his conscientious preparation for his work. He has to study languages which, whatever might be said by the champions of philology of their affinity to his, are to him a jargon to be mastered with immense trouble. He has, moreover, to master a literature which is barren and uninstructive, a philosophy which bewilders rather than strengthens the mind, a mythology which is a tissue of puerility and obscenity, and systems of religious belief so corrupt that their ascendency is the best proof that can be given of the Scripture doctrine of human depravity. Is it a wonder that, in the teeth of such a formidable mass of useless reading, a few missionaries have proved recreant, and taken to work less troublesome and apparently more productive?

The idea deserves expansion. Quiet and systematic study is a pleasure of the most refined, if not the sublimest, stamp, to

a minister of the Gospel in a Christian land. His mind literally feasts and fattens on the graces of genuine poetry, the facts of reliable history, the verities of true science, and the truths of sound philosophy; and even when he has, in the due discharge of his duty, to master current systems of errors, he finds them embodied, as a rule, in readable books, or propounded with some regard to approved rules of taste in composition and logic in reasoning. His reading is not only pleasant but profitable, and the more thoroughly he gives himself to it the more thoroughly he expands his mind and broadens his sympathies. His brother-worker in the vineyard of the Lord in Hindustan is very differently circumstanced in this, as in many other respects. Study is to him a painful rather than a pleasurable duty, and the result is often a burdened rather than an invigorated mind, a bewildered rather than an expanded intellect. The trouble he has to take in mastering foreign languages and making them his own is not without profit, is amply repaid by accessions of intellectual vigor, such as linguistic study is invariably accompanied with and followed by. But whatever study he applies himself to after having done this preliminary work is a wearisome task. If he wishes to study poetry, and through it to obtain an insight into the manners and customs of the people he has to deal with, he has to fight his way not only through extravagances of an exceedingly vicious style of composition, but through a heap of epigrams, anagrams, chronograms, and stuff such as his soul abhorreth. If history attracts him, he has, in order to glean a few sporadic facts of at best doubtful historical value, to wade neck-deep through the rubbish of mythology and fable. If philosophy is his forte, a tremendous mass of verbosity and logomachy, of sophisms and quibbles, before which those embodied in the wildest speculations of the Middle Ages are as specimens of correct reasonings, is before him; while he can scarcely get a correct idea of the many-sided and hoary religion he has to understand, face, and overcome, except after being literally lost in the dreary wastes of an unnaturally developed and corrupt literature.

But what, it may be asked, has the missionary to do with such literature and such philosophy? He has to preach Jesus Christ and him crucified, and his business is to fit himself by

rapidly picking up a foreign tongue for this work of paramount importance. Such assertions have been more than once ventured by men who, while earnestly engaged in doing good among a nominally Christian people, find time to elaborate beautiful theories on the best method of carrying on evangelistic work among the heathen. That the simple story of Jesus Christ and him crucified is, after all, the truth on which the regeneration of Christian and non-Christian lands, as well as that of individual souls, must ultimately hang, no sane Christian will venture to deny. This story, ever fresh, is inherently fitted to touch the dead heart into life and infuse vigor and vitality into effete nationalities and paralyzed civilizations. But a great deal of rubbish has to be removed, especially in heathen lands like our own, ere its legitimate consequences can be realized; and a patient and persistent study of false religions, and the complicated systems of false philosophy indissolubly associated with them, enables the missionary to throw out of the way those heaps of prejudices and errors which make it impossible for the simple story of the cross to reach and influence the heart. The theorists who think that modes of operation which have been successful among nominal Christians must needs be successful among the heathen, brought up amid time-hallowed systems of theology and philosophy, falsely so-called, have only to migrate from the one department of work to the other to be convinced of their error, and forced to exclaim, with redoubled vehemence, "Old Adam is too strong for young Melanchthon!"

One of the many ancient books fitted to illustrate the peculiar trial to which attention has been called is the *Bhagavad Gita*, the precious book which may justly be represented as the fountain-head of Hindu eclecticism. The missionary can scarcely maintain any intercourse with the reading classes in India without hearing the work eulogized and extolled in the most extravagant terms possible. It embodies the loftiest flight of the sublime philosophy of Asia, and presents the cream, so to speak, of Hindu morality and Hindu religion. It is replete with doctrines which stand unrivaled in sublimity and grandeur, truths of a transcendental order set off by sentiments of an elevated type, and precepts which, if generally reduced to practice, would convert this sin-stricken world into a veritable

paradise. As regards its style, human tongue can scarcely describe its beauty and loftiness, while the man must be a consummate dullard who fails to see that it is a master-piece of correct reasoning as well as a model of composition. The missionary, moreover, finds these testimonials indorsed by learned orientalists, who, as a class, have the knack of perceiving beauty where ordinary mortals see nothing but deformity, excellency of arrangement and cogency of reasoning where others see nothing but confusion worse confounded. With bright anticipations, anticipations generated by recommendations both indigenous and foreign, he opens the book and enthusiastically begins its perusal, and, lo! his disappointment commences. Instead of an elegant style, he finds extravagances of diction from which even the worshipers of Dr. Johnson in his own country would recoil in horror. He sees incoherence rather than logical consistency, confusion rather than lucidness of thought, naked sophisms instead of convincing arguments, and crude notions and jarring sentiments agglomerated into a philosophy of the most heterogeneous and the wildest character, while the harsh transitions, incongruous metaphors, and tiresome repetitions he has to wade through would justify even a prostrating fit of homesickness on his part.

One must one's own self read this book in the original, or a literal, verbatim translation of it, such as Thompson's, which will be our itinerary or guide-book in our research into its contents, to be convinced of the soundness of these remarks. We do not expect the general reader—we mean the reader who has not made oriental literature his specialty—to indorse our criticism or to extend to the toil-worn foreign missionary the sympathy we have always felt for him; and we are afraid that our self-imposed task of setting forth the contents of this time-hallowed book may, after all, be thankless. But we must correct an error carefully tended and nourished by a class of philosophers in America, who are striving to naturalize the belief that the fundamental ideas of all religions are alike, and that an attempt to set up one religion on the ruins of others is unjust as well as uncalled-for. And we, therefore, raise the question, What is Hindu eclecticism? The proper answer to this question is furnished by the *Theology*, *Anthropology*, *Soteriology*, and *Eschatology* of the *Bhagavad*

Gita. Let us call attention to three departments of the book, or rather to the contents of the book, which, though presented in promiscuous heaps, without much regard to the advantages of a luminous, concatenated arrangement, may, by a not unnatural application of the laws of analysis, be classed under these heads.

To a correct appreciation of its teaching under these heads some account of the work itself, its origin, its relative position in Hindu literature, and its influence in the development of religious life in our country, is a *sine qua non.*

Some preliminary remarks of a somewhat historical character will, therefore, be first made. The *Bhagavad Gita*, or the Song of Bhagavad, or Krishna, one of the nine incarnations of Vishnu, appears in the *Mahabharat* as one of its multitudinous and grotesque episodes, one of those almost innumerable legendary tales to which, along with those enshrined in the *Ramayuna*, the peculiar excellences and defects of our national character are to be traced. It presents, in poetical language, a philosophical dialogue between Arjun, the most estimable of the characters depicted in that epic, and the above-named god, Krishna, who, in the form of man, acts in the humble capacity of his charioteer. The origin of this dialogue, or rather monologue, as Arjun appears more as a hearer than as a speaker, is set forth with poetic coloring and exaggeration. Arjun sees before him the two hostile branches of the tribe to which he himself belongs: that is, his own relatives and kinsmen, in battle array facing each other, and ready to plunge in dire conflict, and the sight sends a chill of horror into a heart distinguished alike by courage and tenderness. He is unnerved, his limbs become palsied, the hairs on his body stand on end, the blood of his heart is curdled, his head becomes dizzy, and the great consecrated bow in his right hand drops down as if from an arm suddenly struck with paralysis. He is unwilling to fight, to further schemes of self-aggrandizement by slaughtering his own kinsmen in cruel, fratricidal war, or to wade through the blood of his own relations to the unsubstantial and ephemeral glory of an earthly throne. He recognizes divine nature beneath the humble exterior of his charioteer, and anxiously inquires if, under the circumstances, he is not justified in retiring from the field before the clang of trumpets and the

clash of arms make retreat on his part dishonorable and cowardly. This question and others, which as his mind grasps one new truth after another he puts one by one, draw out of his divine interlocutor a series of discourses which, besides nerving him for the approaching conflict, open the eyes of his mind to a variety of mystic truths regarding his own personality, that of the being he is privileged to question, and the real, occult nature of the inanimate world around him. The immediate result of the conversation is a great change in his convictions. He sees truth both absolute and relative, shakes off his temporary weakness, rushes into close encounters, sweeps every thing before him, and maintains, amid scenes of courage and desolation, the character of a brave, all-conquering, but, at the same time, noble-minded and generous warrior.

But though mixed up in popular belief with the *Mahabharat*, and presented ordinarily as an incident of its great plot, it bears unmistakable marks of a much later origin. It is, in the first place, replete with references, both direct and incidental, to the varied schools of philosophy which flourished in India long after the stirring scenes of its Heroic Age had been enacted. The Sankhya philosophy is frequently referred to by name, and the author's predilection for or adherence to its fanciful cosmogony is discovered in unmistakable terms. The Yoga philosophy is the subject of a number of direct as well as oblique allusions, and its doctrine of emancipation consequent on hermit solitude, meditation, and penance, stands out in bold relief from its pages. And, lastly, the uncompromising pantheism of the Vedant, which is also named, is the underlying basis of all its characteristic thoughts and ideas. Again, the *Bhagavad Gita* sets forth the caste system, not in the crude, embryonic state in which it appears in the *Mahabharat*, but in the matured, fully developed state in which it appears in the Institutes of Menu, our national legislator, whose caste regulations have ruled India for ages untold. The essential difference between the four primal castes is herein dwelt upon with marked emphasis, and the duties devolved upon each, and carried down by the law of heredity from father to son, are particularized in such a manner that its composition posterior to the age of the compilation of the Institutes, and consequently to that of the *Mahabharat*, appears to be a certainty. And,

lastly, the Krishna cultus, with its mystic notions of *Bhakti*, or faith, is the most characteristic feature of this philosophico-religious treatise; and no one with even a superficial knowledge of the history of Hinduism will venture to call in question the comparatively recent origin of this worship. When these chronological data are put together, the conclusion at which orientalists like Monier Williams have arrived, namely, that the book was written about the second century of the Christian era, or about the time when Greek eclecticism flourished at Alexandria, will appear irresistible.

The state of things which led to its composition by an unknown author, its ascription to the learned, versatile author of the *Mahabharat*, and its incorporation with that long epic, may be guessed rather than ascertained by proper investigation. The philosophical systems which had been elaborated and matured in the schools had popularized an ideal of piety which, though incompatible apparently with the business of life, has always proved peculiarly attractive to the Hindu mind, if not to the human mind in general. Intense contemplation in solitude, resulting in complete mastery over self, stoic indifference to the occurrences of life, painful or pleasurable, extinction of desire, holy calm, and imperturbable quiescence—such had been the standard of piety set up by the philosophical speculations of the varied schools of thought, of which the eclecticism of the *Gita* may justly be represented as an offshoot. And the more its excellence had been appreciated the more had a distate for the avocations of life been created and a rush toward hermit solitude realized. Nor had the morbid hankering after the enjoyment of undisturbed meditation in sequestered places been confined to the higher order of society, to the sacerdotal and military castes; it had come down from the apex to the very base of the social pyramid, and the industrious trader and even the vile serf had separated themselves from useful and indispensable toil, and swelled the ranks of devotees drawn away from the turmoil of busy life to the repose of severe contemplation. The social machinery, worked by the forces emanating from the caste system, had been unhinged, and a reaction against the results of philosophical speculation was needed to secure its or their harmonious operation. That reaction was initiated by the eclecticism of the

Gita, which not merely restated with emphasis the divine origin of the caste system, but made the duties enjoined by it essential to salvation. But the author of this ancient treatise, whoever he was, could not emancipate himself from the influence either of the philosophical speculations which he tried to work up into a composite system, or of the ideal of piety popularized thereby. And so he vibrates between conflicting sentiments, and ultimately upholds what at first he seems determined to oppose and counteract. The eclecticism of the *Gita,* like every other syncretistic movement, either in the history of philosophy or that of religion, proved a failure; but some of the ideas it popularized have continued to influence Hindu society ever since the period of its composition. Its attempt to work heterogeneous systems of philosophic thought into a homogeneous whole is scarcely appreciated even among people who would exhaust the vocabulary of praise in speaking of its literary merit and ethical purity and excellence. But its attempt to uphold the caste system and make the duties enjoined by it stepping-stones to the higher degrees of perfection attained only by quiet meditation in sequestered places, has proved a grand success, as we shall have an opportunity of showing. But the real excellence of some of the principles to which it has given currency cannot screen it from the charge of a lack of earnestness or laxity of principle which makes its speculations incoherent and its conclusions unsatisfactory. The lax accommodating spirit of compromise, the evil star, so to speak, of all systems of eclecticism, from the oldest of those which flourished in times of yore down to that which was recently transferred wholesale from Boston to Calcutta, is at once the most characteristic and culpable feature of this philosophico-religious treatise.

Having brought our notice of the state of things to which the composition of the *Bhagavad Gita* is to be traced to a close, we are at liberty to call the attention to

I. Its Theology. The theology of the *Gita* is not merely tinctured with, but is nothing more or less than the absolute pantheism of the Vedant. The difference is not to be traced in the creed of the systems, which, in its important features, is one and the same, but in the manner in which this creed seems to have been arrived at. The Vedant arrived at its unmiti-

gated pantheism through the pathway of judicious rejection, while the *Gita* arrived at the same goal through the pathway of a somewhat unnatural though dexterously effected amalgamation. The Vedant came to its grand idea of unity of substance by rejecting two of the three entities held by three of the foregoing schools of philosophic thought, while the *Gita* came to its grand idea of unity by merging these three entities into one substance. To explain this a little reference to the foregoing schools of philosophy, or rather to the principles inculcated in these schools, is necessary. Let us begin with the *Sankhya* system of Kapilu, which is chronologically, perhaps, the first of the six systems into which philosophical speculation developed in India about five or six centuries before the birth of Christ. This system is dualistic, and it admits the eternal co-existence of two entities, the primordial, self-evolving form, called *Prakreti*, and the human soul, *Purush*. The primordial form, or nature in its original essence, passes through varied processes of evolution, gives birth to intelligence, egoism, the elements, both subtle and gross, the senses, and the powers of action, and finally the mind, called the eleventh organ, through which it entraps the soul, eternal and pure, and makes it miserable by begetting in it desire and aversion, such as necessarily lead to action. This system explains the phenomena of creation on thoroughly atheistic principles; and its rampant atheism led to its condemnation among a people more thoroughly religious than even the Athenians, whose fervor in religious matters was eulogized by the Apostle of the Gentiles. It was, therefore, supplanted by the theistic Sankhya of Patanjali, who to the two admitted entities of his atheistic predecessor added another entity, namely, God. This triadism was upheld by the two logical schools which evidently followed the Sankhya schools in the pathway of philosophical investigation; but, though fitted to satisfy the religious longings and aspirations of the Hindu heart, it was too complex to satisfy the generalizing tendency of the Hindu mind. And so it was made to shrink into monism under the auspices of the Vedantic school, which retained God and cast overboard the other two entities associated with him. But the pantheism of the *Gita* is not elaborated in this way. The *Gita* admits the existence of the three entities of the Saukhya philosophy of the theistic

type, and of the logical schools. The divine interlocutor, Krishna, dilates in the fifteenth chapter, as in many other places, on his identity with the world at large, but at the same time calls attention to the existence of two entities beside or rather in himself. Here are the words:

> And I alone am known to be by all the Vedas, and I am the composer of the Vedant, and also the interpreter of the Vedas. These two spirits exist in the world, the divisible and also the indivisible. The divisible is every living being. The indivisible is said to be that which pervades all. But there is another, the highest spirit, designated by the name of the Supreme Soul, which, as the imperishable master, penetrates and sustains the triple world. Since I surpass the divisible, and am higher than the indivisible, I am, therefore, celebrated in the world and in the Vedas as the highest Person.

This extract shows how the triadism of the theistic Sankhya is made to consist with the monism of the Vedant. The divisible spirit is the essence of the soul, dwelling in the Supreme Spirit as his better or superior portion, and individualized in man—the undividuated soul being but a portion of this element of the divinity. The indivisible spirit is the Prakriti of former schools, or essence of matter, which forms the inferior part of the divine nature, and which appears in varied forms in the objects of nature around us. These two entities which Vedantism casts overboard are merged in the all-embracing divine nature by the author of the *Gita*, according to whom the Supreme Soul is a compound of the essence of all individuated souls and the essence of all material phenomena. The Supreme Spirit is represented as evolving the world out of his superior element, and the souls of men out of his supreme element. The union, therefore, effected in the *Gita* is exactly similar to the union between the tiger and the lamb when the latter was in the former!

Pantheism thus elaborated is the theology of this philosophico-religious dialogue or monologue; and innumerable are the passages in which the divine interlocutor, Krishna, represents himself as the original, essential, all-embracing, all-pervading Deity. The sublimest type of egoism with which even pantheism familiarizes us are tame in comparison with that which characterizes his discourses concerning his own mystic personality. All the figures and images by which the essential iden-

tity of the Creator with the creation is set forth in the sacred books of the Hindus, and which, moreover, give a peculiarly imposing aspect to their voluminous literature, are heaped upon him in these discourses. He represents himself as the luminous element of the sun and moon, the heat of the fire, the brilliance of the flame, the light of lights, and the radiance of all radiant objects. He represents himself as the sound of ether, the fragrance of the earth, the everlasting seed of existing things, the life of all living things, the father, mother, husband, forefather, sustainer, friend, and lord of the world. According to Monier Williams' somewhat free version he concludes his description of his own all-pervading personality, or rather essence, with these words:

> . . . "I am its (world's) way and refuge,
> Its habitation and receptacle.
> I am its witness. I am victory
> And energy; I watch the universe
> With eyes and face in all directions turned.
> I dwell as wisdom in the heart of all;
> I am the goodness of the good; I am
> Beginning, middle, end, eternal time,
> The birth and death of all. I am the symbol A
> Among the characters. I have created all
> Out of one portion of myself."

This passage, so decidedly instinct with lofty egoism, gives prominence to the second of the fundamental ideas of the system of theology propounded in this book. It ought to be borne in mind that the *Bhagavad Gita* embodies an attempt not merely to reconcile jarring schools of philosophic thought, but to effect a union between philosophy and popular mythology. And so on the system of absolute pantheism evolved out of the dissertations of the schools we see grafted the theory of incarnation, expounded and illustrated in popular mythology. The speaker is not an ordinary emanation from the Deity, but the Deity himself in the form of man, and he calls himself, not only *Adhyatma*, the Supreme Soul; *Adhibhuta*, the Supreme Existence; *Adhidaivata*, the Supreme God; but *Adhiyajna*, the Supreme Sacrifice. The Hindu doctrine of the cyclic incarnation of Vishnu, the second person of the Hindu triad, is clearly set forth, and the object of these periodic manifestations of the Deity is mentioned, namely, "to establish

righteousness." The divine interlocutor not merely represents himself as an incarnation of God, not merely refers to his past incarnation, not merely dwells on the great object to accomplish which he comes down periodically in various forms from on high, but, at Arjun's special request, appears in his "celestial form." (Monier Williams' translation :)

> "Endowed with countless mouths and countless eyes,
> With countless faces turned to every quarter,
> With ornaments and wreaths and robes divine,
> With heavenly fragrance and celestial weapons,
> It was as if the firmament were filled,
> All in an instant, with a thousand suns
> Blazing with dazzling luster; so beheld he
> The glories of the universe collected
> In the one person of the God of gods."

The last two lines are eminently fitted to correct the mistakes into which Mr. Thompson has fallen, of assuming that the personality of the Godhead is clearly set forth in the *Gita*. God is certainly spoken of in many places as a person endowed with attributes generally ascribed to the Deity, and even moved by infinite compassion to come down, in various forms, to establish righteousness; but the personality ascribed to God is merely a collection of the "glories of the universe." A consistent, coherent system of theology cannot possibly be evolved out of the jarring sentiments brought into one focus in the *Gita*, any more than a homogeneous body of speculative divinity or practical religion can be evolved out of the vaunted eclecticism of the nineteenth century—the eclecticism, we mean, which has been distilled from the writings of Theodore Parker at Calcutta, if not transferred wholesale. But the theology embodied therein settles down, after appearing in varied forms, into that pantheism which assumes the existence of an all-pervading substance rather than of an intelligent, voluntary Agent, as the foundation of existence in all its diversified aspects or modes.

II. The *Anthropology* of the *Gita* is in keeping with its theology, and, like it, vibrates between the transcendental notions of the schools and the coarse ideas embedded in popular mythology and religion. Man is represented as a union of body and soul, the former a portion of the indivisible material essence

in the Deity, and the latter a portion of his higher nature, the spiritual essence. The dualistic nature of man is set forth in the following extract, (Chapter XIII :)

This body, O son of Kunti, is called *Kshetra.* Those who know the truth of things call that which knows this (Kshetra) *Kshetrajna,* (knower of the body.) And know, also, that I am the Kshetrajna in all Kshetras, Bharat. That which is the knowledge of the Kshetra and Kshetrajna is considered by me spiritual knowledge. The great elements, the egoism, the intellect, and also the principle of life and the eleven organs and the five objects of sense—desire, aversion, happiness, and unhappiness, multiplicity of condition, reflection, resolution, (all) this is briefly denominated Kshetra with its passions.

Place this in juxtaposition with the following quotation from Chapter XV:

An eternal portion of me only, having assumed life in this world of life, attracts the mind and the five senses, which belong to nature. Whatever body the Sovereign Spirit enters or quits, it is connected with it by snatching those senses from nature, even as the breeze snatches perfumes from their very bed. This spirit approaches the objects of sense by presiding over the ear, the eye, the touch, the taste, and the smell, and also over the mind. The foolish do not perceive it when it quits the body, nor when it remains, (in it,) nor when actuated by the qualities it enjoys, (the world.) But those who have the eyes of knowledge do perceive it.

These two extracts set forth the author's predilection for and belief in the cosmogony of the Sankhya school, and his anxiety to infuse thereinto the pantheism of the Vedant. Indeed, the author does nothing more or less than transfer wholesale the cosmogony of the former school and substitute for its self-evolving material principle, *Prakriti,* the self-evolving spiritual substance of the latter school. The process of evolution remains the same, intelligence giving birth to egoism or consciousness, and through it to the subtle elements, namely, sound, feel, color, rapidity, and odor; and the five organs of action, namely, the larynx, hands, feet, and the excretory and generative organs. And, lastly, the mind or the eleventh organ is created, and all the evils of life are realized through its ceaseless and malignant activity. The ultimate power of this series is, however, not the primordial form of materialism, but the spiritual substance of pantheism, with its consciousness and

varied mental powers potentially, if not actually, present in it. This spiritual substance, it must be borne in mind, appears in the *Gita* embodied as a rule in an all-embracing infinite personality with a twofold nature, the inferior element manifested in the various modes of material existence and the superior in those of spiritual life.

But how does the theory of cyclic incarnation, or of a series of incarnations culminating in Krishna, the divine interlocutor, consist with this view of pantheistic thought? Are we to suppose that the modern theory of incarnation, that we mean which makes the Lord Jesus Christ the crowning point of a graduated scale of incarnations, was anticipated in India upward of two millenniums ago? We have no doubt but that it was, though the theory does not appear stated with logical precision either in this book or any other work on Hindu philosophy and Hindu religion. How little has modern rationalism added to the results philosophical speculation displayed in ancient times! The theology of the *Gita* renders the essential unity of the human race a logical necessity, or an inevitable logical sequence. If all men are portions of the Deity, both as regards their bodies and as regards their souls, whatever difference we may notice among them must be a difference of degree, not a difference of kind. This irresistible conclusion is, however, evaded by the author. He is a Brahmin as well as a philosopher, and one of his main objects in the composition and circulation of this philosophico-religious treatise is to uphold the caste system in its fully developed form at all hazards. And so he cheerfully sacrifices logical consistency at the altar of the social god whose ascendency must be re-established after the temporary confusion created by philosophical speculation. And he unhesitatingly maintains the essential difference between the recognized castes. The following passage shows that the division of labor introduced by that system is dependent, according to our author, on original propensities rather than on the mere accident of education:

> The offices of Brahmans, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas, and Sudras, O harasser of thy foes! are distributed according to the qualities which predominate in the dispositions of each. Tranquility, continence, mortification, purity, patience, and also rectitude, spiritual knowledge, and spiritual discernment, belief in the ex-

istence of another world, comprise the office of a Brahmin, sprung from his disposition. Valor, glory, strength, firmness, ability in warfare, and also keeping one's ground, liberality, and a lordly character, are the office of Kshatriya, sprung from his disposition. Agriculture, herding of kine, and commerce are the office of a Vaishya, sprung from his disposition. Servitude is the peculiar office of a Sudra, sprung from his disposition. Each man who is satisfied with his office attains perfection.—Chapter XVII.

III. The last line brings us to the *Soteriology* of the *Gita*, a subject of paramount importance, inasmuch as we see reflected in it the notions of salvation now current among our countrymen. The soteriology of the *Gita* appears at first sight to have been a re-action against that of the schools, the jarring theories of which it endeavored to weld into a homogeneous whole. The watch-word of the schools was *quiescence*, but that of the *Gita* seems to have been *action*. The schools systematically opposed action, and represented it as the source of all our trouble. According to their teaching attachment to the world breeds desire, and desire breeds action, and action breeds merit or demerit, and merit or demerit brings in its train reward or punishment and a fresh transmigration, and all the evils associated with it. Action, therefore, with its antecedents and consequents, should be annihilated or superseded by meditative stillness and quiescence, ere the vexed spirit can be liberated from the thralldom of transmigration and merged into the material or divine essence as a drop in the ocean. The schools were certainly at loggerheads with one another on many of the fundamental questions of theology and science, but they were unanimous in denouncing action and upholding passive contemplation as essential to salvation, in the Hindu sense of the term; that is, absorption in the Deity. Moreover, this doctrine of the schools was by no means received by the people at large as a beautiful theory to be revolved in the mind for a few minutes and then quietly shelved. On the contrary, earnest souls from all ranks of society succumbed to its fascinating influence, separated themselves from needed work, betook themselves to hermit solitude, and wasted their energies in indolent meditation. To remedy this growing evil the *Gita* appeared, with its watch-word *action*, opposed to the passiveness and quiescence of the schools; and the arguments by which it

sustains its position are eminently fitted to influence for good even the contemplative Hindu, who looks forward to assimilation in the Deity as the *summum bonum*. Action, the *Gita* maintains, is inevitable. The devotee must breathe, his blood must circulate, the varied portions of his body must discharge their functions to enable him to give himself to that quiet and contemplative life which has such an irresistible charm for him. Moreover, he must eat and drink a little in order to sustain life, and this means action. Action, then, being inevitable, to denounce it as the cause of all our sorrows and discomforts, and attempt its extinction, is not true philosophy.

But action, the schools maintain, is fructescent, and must bear its fruit either in reward or in punishment, and thereby prolong the chain of transmigrations. The author of the *Gita* admits that action is fructescent, but he maintains that it is not invariably so. When action is performed with a view to rewards or punishments, that is, when action is performed with interested motives, it bears fruit, prolongs the chain of transmigrations, and perpetuates the misery of existence. But when action is performed without any regard to consequences its effect is salvation, not prolonged enthrallment. Not action in general, but action with interested motives, action from selfish desires and selfish aims, ought to be denounced. The necessity of action being admitted, the question rises, What course is action to take? Or, in other words, What are men to do to be saved from the misery of prolonged existence? The *Gita*, in reply to this important question, does not give an uncertain sound. Men are to perform the duties of their castes, nothing more and nothing less. The track chalked out for a man by the rules and regulations of his caste is to him the path of righteousness and salvation; and on it he is safe, it being absolutely impossible for him to go wrong while treading it patiently and perseveringly. "It is better to perform one's own duty, even though it be devoid of excellence, than another's duty well. He who fulfills the office obligated by his own nature does not incur sin. One should not reject the duty to which one is born, even if it be associated with error, for all (human) undertakings are involved in error, as fire is by smoke."

But the soteriology of the book, like its theology and its

anthropology, is involved inextricably in confusion, because the author, while determined to give prominence to some principles of a practical stamp, seems to have been unable to free himself from the fascinating influence of the ideal of piety held up by the schools — the devotee seated cross-legged or standing still and immovable beneath the outstretched branches of a shady tree, with his eyes fixed on the tip of his nose, his breath regulated according to fixed rules, his mind concentrated on one theme or object of contemplation, his passions and appetites not merely controlled but extinguished, his desires and aspirations subsiding into a holy calm, the serenity of his soul making him impassable or indifferent to hunger and thirst, heat and cold, pleasure and pain, and his entire self, separated from its accidental surroundings, merged into the Deity. No Hindu thinker, in the days of our author, however broad might be his thoughts, could contemplate this picture of tranquil meditation without being instinctively led to recognize its immense superiority to the bustle and turmoil of an active life. And so the author of the *Gita*, like the great Buddha himself, after flying from it for a moment, swung back to it with redoubled momentum. And its theory of salvation is the theory to which universal homage is paid in Hindustan to-day; the theory, we mean, which makes an inferior degree of salvation hang on *kanuayoga*, or the devotion of works, while salvation, in the fullest sense of the term, is only attainable through the pathway of *pryanyoga*, or the devotion of knowledge or hermit solitude and concentrated meditation.

IV. The *Eschatology* of the book need not detain us long. The Hindu doctrine of transmigration, with its ascending and descending series of animated bodies, innumerable births and deaths, terminating, after the slow cycle of ages innumerable, in absorption in the Deity, is the basis of all its speculations on this subject. It, however, recognizes one principle which should not be passed over unnoticed, namely, that a man's condition in the world to come is determined by his meditations rather than action in this life.

He who, remembering me at the moment of death, quits the body and comes forth, enters my nature, there is no doubt about that. Or again, whatever nature he thinks on when he abandons the body at the last, to that only does he go, O son of Kunti!

having been always conformed to that nature. Therefore think of me at all times and fights.

It is impossible to enumerate the superstitions to which this and other passages of the sort have given birth, or the various expedients adopted to direct the thoughts of the dying Hindu to the incarnation of Vishnu, who is the principal interlocutor in this dialogue. The Hindu father of the *Vaishnab* sect, or the sect which upholds the worship of Vishnu, in preference to that of any other god, to that either of *Brahma*, the first, or *Maheshwar*, the third person in the Hindu triad, gives names to his male children, such as may in the hour of death recall the Deity to his mind; or he writes some of his hundred and eight names on his sacred garments and on his arms and on the palms of his hands, that his eyes may fall on them and bring up associations fitted to pave his way to heaven before they are closed forever. The immoral principle that man, however bad his life has been, will enter heaven if at the moment of death he repeats the name of Vishnu, is a legitimate deduction from such a passage, though perhaps the author and its compeers did not foresee the wrong use which has been made in subsequent ages of their unguarded statements!

We confess we don't rise from the perusal of this time-hallowed and extravagantly venerated book with a very high opinion of its contents. The devotee who, amid the enlightenment of the nineteenth century, represents God as the life of every living thing, from man down to the meanest worm, and the aggregate of all forces, mechanical, chemical, electric, and magnetic, as the sum total, in short, of all forms of life and all material agencies, may be in raptures when speaking of its teachings. The self-styled anthropologist, who throws overboard the supernatural element in Christianity, and represents it as a development of, or an outgrowth from, pre-existing religious ideas, may see in it a grand stepping-stone to the rapid progress made in subsequent ages in religion and morals. But we are ordinary mortals, with no pompous titles, and we cannot help representing its general teaching, theological and moral, as on the whole pernicious, even while we are not backward in recognizing the excellence of a few truths and principles scattered up and down among its miscellaneous contents. We have no hesitation whatever in affirming that this and other

books of the sort have, on the whole, been so many drags on, rather than incentives to, the progress of the world in religion and morals, and we fearlessly oppose this bold assertion to the sentimental talk which is unhappily gaining ground even in the Churches of Christendom.

Art. II.—SHAKESPEARE: HIS GENIUS AND TIMES.

To those who are in the habit of frequenting our great libraries there is nothing so utterly astounding as the immensity of those accumulations that cluster around two books—the Bible and the plays of Shakespeare. In 1879 H. H. Morgan, of St. Louis, published a Topical Shakespeariana, in which he gives a list of two thousand English books devoted entirely to varied discussions of the works of the Bard of Avon. This catalogue is exclusive of various editions, and is confessedly in no sense exhaustive.

A great poet has drawn a parallel between Shakespeare and the sea, and after reminding us of it, Swinburne says: "For two hundred years students have gone forth in every kind of boat to more fully explore this sea—majestic galleys steered by such geniuses as Coleridge and Goethe, and also the paltriest fishing craft." Every modest man will agree with him, when, dwelling on the figure, he continues to say: "The limits of this ocean, the law of its tides, the motive of its forces, the mystery of its unity, and the secret of its changes, no seafarer of us all may ever think thoroughly to know."* The writer of this critique ventures to launch on this ocean *his* little paper catamaran, not pretending that his frail craft, though boldly launched on the boundless sea, will be able, in any degree, to solve the enigmas which other and wiser voyagers have failed to unravel, but for the purpose of running through a portion of the fleet that has preceded him, making himself familiar with the log-books they have so reliably kept, and then laying his gathered treasures where they can be seen by eyes less favored than his own have been.

The literature of this subject, turning for a moment away from the sea, is an open vast prairie, with all its vast wealth of

* "A Study of Shakespeare," pp. 1, 2.

color. We go to every open or opening flower of comment, or of criticism, on which we can lay our discriminating fingers; we pluck whatever we can find of rare or unusual sweetness, and take away its richest perfume by an involuntary absorption that well-nigh intoxicates us.

There is something specially exciting, enriching, exalting, in the honey and aroma with which such crudites as Schlegel, Drake, and Taine have filled their beauteous nectar-bearing cups. It may be that some of the most startling sentences of these brilliant commentators may cling to us, as the silken fibers of the cotton plant might adhere to the homely burr dragged through a field of Southern beauty. If it be so, who has the right to accuse or censure? Who will presume to require us to tie a tag to each separate fiber, that it may be traced to the actual plant on which it grew. To give, in an article of this kind, to every thread its owner's name, would be literally

"To guard a title that was rich before,"

and that would surely be "wasteful and ridiculous excess." *

It is a singular and somewhat startling fact that there is no great English writer against whom a certain class of so-called religionists have cherished so much ill-grounded prejudice as against the author of the most charming and elegant dramas that ever dropped from a mortal's pen. Some thirty years ago a Methodist preacher was importuned to arrest the character of his immediate predecessor before his Conference. The distinguished man against whom the assault was directed had been educated at West Point, became a doctor of divinity, and when he died was a colonel in the Union Army. A string of charges had been drawn up, including various offenses, but all paling, as the accuser thought, before the enormity of the final culminating one, which was that he, a minister of the Church, persisted in privately reading "Shakespeare's theater plays!"

The prejudice of which this charge was a faint indication

* For the writer of this article to disclaim a scholarship, of which it were vanity in him to suppose himself even suspected, would be to invite from the really learned deserved contempt. He disclaims any attempt to ascend a tribune to which Ulrici, Schlegel, Coleridge, Hudson, and Rolfe have been exalted with merited honors. He does not assume to be a Shakespearian in any high sense. He only echoes the conclusions of acknowledged critics, yet at the same time he claims the right of uttering an opinion or two distinctively his own.

was much stronger fifty or a hundred years ago. John Newton, sometimes called "the pious"—the companion of Cowper, and the author of several favorite hymns—was a great letter-writer. In one of his epistles to a friend by the name of Bull he makes this humiliating confession: "If my good folks were to catch me reading Shakespeare, I would rather hide the book than offend them. For they, being no judges of Shakespeare, or of my motive for reading him, would be hurt if they saw a play-book in my hand. I would not wish them to look more favorably upon play-books than they do, or to think unfavorably of me on Shakespeare's account." There seems to be a great want of manliness in this willingness to hide the book; but allowance must be made for the narrowness and prudery of the circle in which he moved. What shall we say of the — (we dare not characterize them) who, on the death of Wesley, finding among his papers an annotated copy of our great poet, at once destroyed it, lest it should injure Mr. Wesley's influence among religious people? It was an act of ruthless literary vandalism, no matter how saintly the man that committed it. All healthy and true religion has suffered an injury thereby. Mr. Wesley's annotations were doubtless appreciative. They may have been, they doubtless were, remarkably laudatory. If they had not been, if they had been in any sense disparaging, they would never have been destroyed by his mistaken literary censors.

The prejudice of which the above narration is an illustration has not as yet utterly died out. There are those whose piety and good intentions no man can impeach who still think that it is an unwise, not to say a wicked, thing to spend time in reading this great master of the human heart. Such purists, no doubt, class him with Byron, Shelley, and Tom Moore. They regard him as entitled to a place on the same shelf as Rabelais, Smollett, and Sterne, and to make him a study as dangerous as would be the study of Tom Paine, Voltaire, or our modern Ingersoll. Of course this is all a mistake, and the best minds in the Church no longer hesitate to say so.

Theories.

Many and strange have been the opinions held regarding the great intellectual prodigy of the sixteenth century—nay, we

may say the greatest prodigy of all times and all lands. The most absurd of all is that which pretends to regard him as *a myth.* The actual existence of Shakespeare, and the incidents related concerning his life, are as demonstrably true as are any historical facts. The lives of Charlemagne, Napoleon, Lincoln, are not more true. We may have our doubts concerning Homer and Ossian; but it were idiocy to indulge in any so far as William Shakespeare is concerned. He is as real as are Macaulay, or Carlyle, or Eliot to the readers of to-day, and is far more so than will be Hartmann, or Emerson, or Mill when three hundred years shall have rolled into the great unknown.

A few half-demented aspirants to literary fame have labored hard to prove that Shakespeare's name was but a *nom de plume*, and that the actual name of the writer of the plays to which it was attached was Bacon; that, while his brain conceived and his pen wrote "Hamlet" and "Macbeth" and "Lear," and all the other wonderful tragedies and comedies that cluster round them, he was too modest or too cowardly to have his real relationship to such marvels known to his contemporaries or to the men of any age. There is a great deal of ingenuity and some sincerity apparent in the various lines of argument employed to sustain this—to say the least of it—extraordinary view. The style of Bacon is compared with that of Shakespeare. Parallel passages are quoted. Especial prominence is given to the fact that when Aristotle is quoted the same mistranslations occur. It is contended that Bacon was the only one man, fitted by culture and position, to write the dramas bearing Shakespeare's name. All these arguments, and with them every other, melt into dissipated mist before candid criticism. The Baconian delusion is a species of insanity, which, in its first and most distinguished victim—who, by a singular coincidence, bore the name she would so unjustly exalt—developed into a violent madness, justifying personal restraint.

James Freeman Clarke has dealt this delusion some masterly though semi-satirical blows. He reaches the conclusion that it would be easier to believe that Shakespeare wrote the works of Bacon than that Bacon wrote the plays to which the name of Shakespeare is attached. The argument on the other side has been put most admirably by Hudson. We have only space for the briefest outline possible. He elaborates the following

points: 1. Bacon's ingratitude to Essex was such as the author of Lear could never have been guilty of. 2. Whoever wrote the plays of Shakespeare was not a scholar. He had something vastly better than learning—but he had not that. 3. Shakespeare never philosophizes, Bacon never does any thing else. 4. Bacon's mind, great as it was, might have been cut out of Shakespeare's and never have been missed.

Mr. Swinburne says of the supposition that there was a *double authorship*, Shakespeare and some one else—which is assumed by some — that it is a position naturally impossible to refute. "It is the last resource of an empiric, the last refuge of a sciolist; a refuge which the soundest of scholars will be the slowest to seek, a resource which the most competent of critics will be least ready to adopt." Of a man clinging to such a theory he says, adopting the language of Touchstone,

> "God help thee, shallow man!
> God make incisions in thee! Thou art raw!"

In a line precedent, but which in its connection is not to be quoted on this page, he explains,

> "Like an ill-roasted egg all on one side,"

and then goes on to say, "And raw such a man must remain for all his learning, and for all the incisions that may be made in the horny hide of self-conceit, to be pierced by the puncture of no man's pen;" which, notwithstanding its Carlylean obscurity, is a sentiment worthy of adoption by all.

Dr. J. Snider of Missouri, at a gathering of the Concord School of Philosophy last summer, assumed, with a mysticism that no man can be expected to penetrate, that *he* had discovered Shakespeare's secret. Up to this time but few were aware that Shakespeare had any secret other than that which attaches to all works of undoubted genius. The doctor says: "Shakespeare's dramas move in an ethical world. They portray a world of conflict, they mediate these conflicts and bring all colliding elements into harmony, returning the deed upon the doer." That Shakespeare's dramas do this is, indeed, unquestionably true. But this has never been "*a secret.*" This is no discovery! After such a prelude the world—not

the Concordian, but the outside, world—was looking for some astounding revelation. But we say with Pistol:

"Hope is a curtail day in some affairs;"

and still more appropriately with Macbeth:

"Be these juggling fiends no more believed,
That palter with us in a double sense;
And keep the word of promise to our ear,
And break it to our hope."

After all that was reported as having been said at Concord, the world knows no more of Shakespeare than Coleridge did a generation or more ago.

His Style.

Critics of the seventeenth century say of Shakespeare's style that it is "the most obscure, pretentious, painfully laborious, and absurd that could be imagined." This opinion later generations have not indorsed. Modern criticism has come to a conclusion the very opposite.

Heine tells us that "The scene of his plays is the globe, eternity the period of the action of his pieces, and humanity his hero." Goethe declares that "In Shakespeare nature is uttering her own oracles. My men," says he, "are soap bubbles inflated by romantic caprice." If I consult Carlyle this is what he tells me: "Shakespeare penetrates into immaterial things—far into nature, with his divine splendors and infernal terrors, his Ariel melodies and mystical Mandragora moans; far into art and artifice. Shakespeare knew innumerable things—what men are, and what the world is, and how and what men aim at there." "Some one," says he, "calls it [Shakespeare] The Grand Sacred Epos, or Bible of world history, infinite in meaning as the divine mind it emblems."

The great historian Hallam has put these remarkable words on record: "The name of Shakespeare is the greatest in all literature. No man ever came near him in the creative power of the mind. No man ever had at once such strength and such variety of imagination. Comparing him with Homer, the tragedians of Greece, the poets of Italy, . . . one man has far more than surpassed them all. Others may have been as sublime; others may have been more pathetic; others may have

excelled him in grace and purity of language and have shunned some of his faults; but the philosophy of Shakespeare, his intimate searching out of the human heart, whether in the gnomic form of sentence or in the dramatic exhibition of character, is a gift peculiarly his own."

So our own Hudson. He says, with an authority from which no man desires to appeal: "His rank in the school of morals is no less high than in the school of art. He is every-where worthy to be our teacher and guide in what is morally just and noble and right, as in what is artistically beautiful and true."

Richard Grant White, with a rare insight, declares: "If the plague had not spared him, the Anglo-Saxon race would have lacked a certain degree of that elevation of mental and moral tone, and that practical wisdom, which distinguishes it among the peoples." He does not hesitate to say that he regards him as "a source of instruction more nearly priceless than any, except that which falls from the lips of Jesus of Nazareth."

"The highest glory of Shakespeare's poetry," says Prof. H. Reed, "is *its spirituality. It is full of the life of faith.*" These words are so remarkable that we presume to italicise them.

The most brilliant and incisive of all the *critiques* on Shakespeare has, however, been written by a Frenchman. With rare analytical power he tells his countrymen, infatuated as he knows them to be with Corneille and Racine, that Shakespeare is "an extraordinary species of mind, perplexing to all modes of analysis and reasoning. All-powerful—excessive—equally master of the sublime and the base. The most creative that ever engaged in an exact copying of the details of actual existence; in dazzling caprice of fancy, in the profound complications of human passion. A nature poetical, immortal, inspired, superior to reason—so extreme in joy and pain—so abrupt of gait—so stormy and impetuous in his tramp, that a great age only could have cradled such a man."

"I have made," says Swinburne, the last witness we shall call, "the study of Shakespeare the chief intellectual business, and have found it the chief spiritual delight, of my life. He is a strong and subtle searcher of hearts, the just and merciful judge and painter of human passion. It is proverbially impossible to determine by selection the greatest works of Shakespeare. There is, unquestionably, however, no creation of his

that will bear comparison with 'Much Ado About Nothing.' Who [he asks] can speak of all things, or of half that is in Shakespeare—who can speak worthily of any? Shakespeare, to whom all things were better known by instinct than ever they can be by experience to other men."

As with every other great poet, and as with every other writer of mark in any of the walks of literature, Shakespeare has been charged with plagiarism. That he did take from other men, that he took from *all* men, in a sense to be explained by and by, is willingly, exultingly confessed. He from whom was taken was greatly enriched by the taking; for when returned, as returned they were, it was seen that the theft, unlike any other stealing, was a benefaction, not only to the man honored by the abstraction, but to mankind at large.

Shakespeare was born in 1564 and died in 1616. His life, therefore, embraces a period of fifty-two years. This covers the entire reign of Elizabeth and portions of the reigns of Mary and James I., Mary preceding and James following the Maiden Queen. Though this period was inclusive of what is called, so far as learning is concerned, "the Renaissance," it was, in fact, an age of great grossness and vulgarity. There had been civil wars. How natural, therefore, that Shakspeare should have to chronicle atrocious deeds! There is not in English literature a more appalling picture than one given us in "King Lear." The scene is in Gloster's castle. The actors Gloster, Cornwall, and Regan, Lear's daughter.

Corn. See it shalt thou,—never!
Fellows, hold the chair:
[GLO. *is held down in his chair, while* CORN. *plucks out one of his eyes, and sets his foot on it.*]
Glo. He that will think to live till he be old,
Give me some help:—O cruel! O ye gods!
Reg. One side will mock another; the other too.
[CORNWALL *then tears out* GLOSTER'S *other eye, and, throwing it upon the ground, exclaims:*]
Out vile jelly! Where's thy luster now?
Reg. Go thrust him out at gates, and let him smell
His way to Dover.

Eugene Sue, in his "Mysteries of Paris," has attempted to imitate this scene, but how poor the imitation!

It is true that at this time the ladies of the court studied

Greek, but the social condition of the people was low, almost beyond our conception to-day. Clergymen dressed in green and red and yellow, wore crisped hair, and walked in peaked and buckled shoes. "To meet a priest in those days was to behold a peacock that spreadeth his tail when he danceth before the hen." * They were immoral, and held in very low esteem. The people believed in witches, fairies, goblins. Every village had its ghost. Church-yards were haunted, as was the scene of every fatal accident, and, therefore, impassable. Nothing had such a charm for the common people as prodigies. They saw, or thought they saw, blue lights, corpse-candles, tomb-fires. They heard demoniacal voices. They attached great importance to charms and spells, and the telling of fortunes. Palmistry and the making of periapts was a profession; by the one, individual history was read in the lines of the hand, and by the writing and wearing of the other disease and calamity were warded off. Tumors were removed by nine strokes of a dead man's hand. Scrofula was cured by the touch of a king or queen. Ruptures were reduced by the sufferers passing through a young tree split for the purpose. Bodies were supposed to bleed at the approach of their murderers. Men were said to shudder when walking unconsciously over the ground destined to be their final resting-place. It was the Age of Superstition.

It has been objected that there are passages in Shakespeare too indecent to be read in mixed or refined society; that "his characters call things by their dirty names;" that "the talk of his gentlemen and ladies is full of coarse allusions;" that "they have a vocabulary as coarse as Rabelais, and that they drain it dry." It is said that "they kill, violate, poison, burn, and fill the stage with every abomination." To all of which it may be said, no wise man advocates the promiscuous reading of an unexpurgated edition. It is true, men were never depicted in such hideousness before, but it ought to be remembered that it was the hideousness of truth! Men did kill, poison, burn, just as he says they did. They were drunken, unclean, cruel. Shakespeare was only true to the times in which he lived.

The Bible was translated at about the same time that the

* Holinshed.

"Tempest" and "Midsummer Night's Dream" were written. It contains some passages which good taste, no matter how deep the piety of its possessor may be, declines to quote in every circle of society to-day. Coarseness was the fault of the age. Women of high rank wrote letters to each other and to men much worse than any thing that Shakespeare wrote. Johnson says, "Shakespeare is more agreeable to the ears of the present age than any other author equally remote." The pious, the revered Robertson, says of Shakespeare, "He is healthy; I pardon even his worldly coarseness." Swinburne, after mentioning "the fetid fun and rancid ribaldry of Pandarus and Thersites," speaks of Shakespeare's alleged imitation of Rabelais thus: "Shakespeare has hardly once or twice burned as much as a pinch of fugitive incense on the altar of Cloacina, the only Venus acknowledged and admired by such men as Swift, Smollett, and Carlyle. . . . He paints nature in its littlenesses, its weaknesses, its excesses, its irregularities, and its rages. . . . He exhibits man at his meals, in bed, at play, drunk, mad, sick. He does not dream of ennobling, but of copying human life, and only aspires to make his copy more energetic and more striking than the original. His characters have bad blood and a ready hand; they abandon themselves to their passions, and go just as their passions lead them. He knows by experience the manners of country, court, and town."

The introduction of a new theory as to Shakespeare's relation to the literature of all time should be done with becoming modesty in an age bristling with commentators and critics. The readers of these pages are the first to weigh the theory, and they must take the modesty for granted.

In every age prior to the universal diffusion of knowledge, especially prior to the invention of printing, there was always floating around among the people a vast amount of traditional wisdom. It was embalmed in story and in song. It was carried from place to place by minstrels and troubadours. Midway between the creation of the world and the birth of Christ we have one inspired interpreter of nature, and we have two men who, without the divine afflatus, gave expression to all the accumulated wisdom of the times that preceded them. This remarkable trio was Solomon, Sophocles, and Socrates. The divine inspiration of Solomon exalts him above the level of

this discussion. Sophocles was confessedly one of the world's greatest geniuses. He, however, has no special place in the argument. With regard to Socrates more must be said. It is known to all scholars that between four and five hundred years before Christ there was born to a sculptor in Athens a son to whom this name was given. He was not, at least in his youth, a studious man, and yet his name is likely to live as long as that of Solomon. He was a talker, a conversationalist. The street, the shop, the market-place and the exchange, were in succession his school, and any listener his pupil. He was a compound of logician and buffoon. He had a prophet's flaming heart and a brain of ice. In his physiognomy he was ugly beyond all compare. Starr King, by a few striking words, has made his appearance as palpable to our mind's eye as we have otherwise been made familiar with the features of George Washington. This marvelous word-painter tells us that "his head was as round as a pumpkin—was goggle-eyed in the sense that a lobster is; that he squinted; that his nose was a short, flat snub; that his mouth was wide and his lips thick; that his neck was chunky, and that he was as corpulent as an ideal alderman; that he was, in short, a cross between a Brahmin and a Satyr."

Yet this pug-nosed, chuckle-headed saint got together more knowledge than all the uninspired men that had preceded him. This "compromise between Pythagoras and Punch" gave to the world a wisdom in the possession of which it exulted for nearly two thousand years. At the end of this two thousand years, however, there was born in England, of humble, if not obscure, parents, a fair child, which developed into a man of royal mien, as symmetrical as the Adonis of whom he afterwards so sweetly sang. *He* added to the mental wealth of the world a wisdom surpassing that of Solomon and Socrates combined. The theory of the writer of this paper is that these three men were provided by a watchful and benevolent Providence to be the diligent conservators of all the floating and ungarnered wisdom of their day. They caught that wisdom as it dropped from the lips of the troubadour or from the lips of the border minstrel, as it was jestingly uttered in the stinging satires and biting repartees of professional humorists and hired clowns; they clipped it out of novels and humorous plays; they culled

it from the proverbial sayings of the common people, and from the well watched and loudly applauded utterances of courtiers and kings. They gleaned it from soldiers and sailors, from the hangers-on in courts of law. They made record of it as it was read by stately embassadors from foreign lands, or as it was mouthed in martial orders from castle walls or fields of blood. They gathered it, at the risk of morals and of life, from way-side taverns, from gambling-hells, from sponging-houses, and from the prisons in which men languished away a lifetime to atone for petty debts. They treasured it as it fell in stilted phrase from ermined judge, or as it was mumbled by the humblest digger of the murderer's grave. They condensed all the vapors of romance—they crystallized the gold which men were trampling under their unheeding feet. They caught the gossamer threads that floated in the every-day life of men, and wove those threads into garments of wondrous beauty for all coming men and all coming ages to admire and wear. If piety was in the air, then were these conservators pious, and Solomon's thoughts were cast in a religious mold. If the age was stirred by great mental activity, and the thoughtful were talking of duty and morals, then Solomon and Socrates stamped their disputations with lofty words, calling their utterances philosophy, and giving them, by the richness of their rhetoric, a currency that outreached their own land and age, and which bids fair to outreach all lands and all ages.

Shakespeare, with a wiser, higher nature than had been bestowed upon any that had preceded him, did the most and the grandest portion of this eclectic work. He laid the Hebrew money-changer Shylock, the Greek cynic Thersites, and the Roman voluptuary Antony, under tribute, as he did men of every race and nation. He listened to the folk-lore of Denmark, to Boccaccio's stories of Italian life, to the love songs of the strutting Spaniard and the tawny Moor. He familiarized himself with translations from languages long dead, and read the current histories of the Norman, the Saxon, and the Celt. He gave expression to every thing that was worthy of being expressed. His work was not the embalming of dead bodies destined never to live again; it was the storing of seed having life in itself—the conservation of germinal truths destined, as by an eternal purpose, to make green and glad, lustrous, all the

accessible hills and pinnacled mountains of the future. In this light how utterly contemptible do all charges of plagiarism appear, with which pigmy men, with their little straws, have sought to pierce his coat of mail! In this light they sink out of sight, and they sink forever.

Shakespeare transmuted all that his acute ears heard, all that his penetrating eyes saw, all that his tenacious memory could retain, into ingots of silver which no use can ever tarnish—into diamonds which no length of time can ever dim.

"He was not of his age, but for all time."

It may be said of him, in a higher sense than it could be said of Milton:

"His soul was like a star, and dwelt apart."

Art. III.—POPULAR EDUCATION THE GENIUS OF AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS.

The perpetuity of our free institutions, as well as the national prosperity and happiness of the people, can be best promoted by promoting the instruction and knowledge of the rising generation. Is it not manifest that of all the world the United States can least afford to neglect the general and thorough culture of its people? Circumstances have made this question at the present moment of the very gravest urgency. If we are in large measure what our fathers have made us, the next generation will be sure to be more or less fashioned by those who to-day provide and direct our systems of education. It is not enough that we have an immense territory or an immense population, but every acre and every man, where nature has been equally bountiful, should be the equal in productive power of any other acre or any other man. It is not enough that, with a population of nearly fifty millions, only about twenty-five thousand students annually find their way through any and all of the old literary colleges. It seems obvious that both colleges and common schools require the earnest attention and the most precious resources of all the States, as well as of the General Government. Without undertaking the entire control of the general subject, Congress may yet legitimately make a contribution so emphatic that no State will falter in generous co-operation. The light of the nation, as that of the sun among planetary states, should break forth as the greater morning light to rule the day.—*Speech of Hon. Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont, on Educational Bill in Senate of United States, Dec.* 15, 1880.

In his elaborate "Essays on Republicanism in Europe," Emilio Castelar says: "One of the greatest benefits of liberty is its wealth of education, and one of the greatest benefits of education is the ability it gives to take account of existing facts in

all our political solutions." As does he, so do we, take the words *education* and *politics* in their natural and broad senses —the former meaning to lead out and develop, as also to instruct; the latter being used to designate the relations and duties of citizenship. To educated minds alone are productive and useful ideas spontaneous. "It is much easier," says Castelar, "to persecute gas and imprison a sunbeam than to persecute or imprison an idea." All science that throws any revealing and useful light on the history of man, on his place in the range of being, and on his relative position among his fellows, teaches that he is ennobled by true education. In an address made Jan. 14, 1881, to a delegation of colored citizens, General Garfield (then President-elect) said:

> I noted as peculiarly significant one sentence in the remarks of General Elliott, to the effect that the majority of citizens, as he alleges, in some portions of the South, are oppressed by the minority. If this be so, why is it so? Because a trained man is two or three men in one in comparison with an untrained man; and, outside of politics and outside of parties, that suggestion is full, brimful, of significance; that the way to make the majority always powerful over the minority is to make its members as trained and intelligent as the minority itself. That brings the equality of citizenship, and no law can confer and maintain in the long run a thing that is not upheld with a reasonable degree of culture and intelligence. Legislation ought to do all it can.

This "culture and intelligence" are matters of vast importance to all our citizens. And yet they meet with organized opposition. Besides the deeply seated opposition in the South to the education of the masses of the people, the adroit, earnest, and persistent efforts of a large class of un-Americanized citizens, who are under the dictation of a foreign spiritual and semi-political power, tend to modify and to subvert our grand system of common schools, because they are well-suited to the enlightenment, the morals, and the civilization of the people, and to turn the educational and literature funds of the States into sectarian channels.

In no period of our colonial and national history have the demands of representative men and of cultivated society been more urgent that a high degree of intelligence and morals pervade all ranks of our citizens than in this, when immigration is flooding our centers of trade, our commerce, and popular ideas

with foreign ignorance, infidelity, and monarchical ideas—a condition of things that political demagogues aim to turn to partisan and sectional purposes, and sometimes to personal aggrandizement, and particularly since the enfranchisement of millions of the colored race. This inflow of two such elements into the body politic calls for wise and vigorous efforts to educate the masses of the people, and to assimilate them to the nation.

What we, in this paper, claim to be in accord with the genius of American institutions, has of late found expression in Congress, in what is known as Burnside's Bill, for the promotion by the country of popular education, in the Southern States particularly. The chief features of this bill are, (1,) that the proceeds from the sale of public lands and from patents shall be invested in bonds, the interest of which shall be appropriated to public schools; (2,) that for ten years the apportionment shall be according to the number of persons in each State, of ten years old and upward, who cannot read and write; (3,) that one third of the proceeds of the fund shall be given to endow colleges established under the Act of 1862, until each State has $30,000 per annum for their support. These provisions are wisely conditioned on the maintaining by each State schools for all children (including the colored) between six and sixteen years of age, for at least three months of the year, and after 1885 for four months. This bill passed the house by a large majority, all the Republicans voting for it, as did some of the influential members from the South. No more important step for the prosperity, peace, and effective unity of the nation has ever been taken. It will grandly supplement, if not exceed, the power of the Peabody Fund.

Though amid fluctuations and the subsidence of zeal, it has ever been the policy of this nation—as clearly indicated in colonial history, in the Constitution of the United States, and in those of the several States, as it has also been of the Church, in harmony with the genius of Christianity—to foster the cause of education. Sometimes it has been limited to the comparatively few, that is, to the Christian ministry, to educators, and to the learned professions, but the general tendency has been to popular intelligence. Any exceptions have been for the purpose of keeping the common people and the servile race in

submission to aristocratic and designing men, whose aims were to rule the conscience and to extend the sway of political power. The aims of those thoroughly tinged with foreign ideas, who would unite the temporal and spiritual powers, giving to the latter the supremacy in education and in politics, have been furthered by a thorough and persistent assertion of authority over the votaries of priestly ecclesiasticism. In the other direction it was the study of masters and of legislators to keep the slaves in abject ignorance. And, after the lapse of years since their manumission and enfranchisement, the people who dominate in the South wisely yield to the popular demand because their political safety requires the education of all the citizens, black and white.

In the early history of the Church it was not so. Besides the "extraordinary teachers whom Christ employed to lay the foundations of his everlasting kingdom," as says Mosheim, there were, in the first century, such men as Clemens, Bishop of Rome; Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch; and Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, who, though not *remarkable* for learning, yet employed their pens in the cause of Christianity and the education of the people. In the second century "the number of learned men increased considerably, the majority of whom were philosophers attached to the eclectic system." In the third century, and, we hold as susceptible of proof, according to the spirit and workings of Christianity, the cause of letters, philosophy, and education by degrees triumphed—a success that was largely due to Origen, who, a Platonist in early life, unwisely blended the tenets of that system with the purer and more sublime doctrines of the Gospel. The result was not wholly bad. Though the faith of some was thereby perverted and controversies arose therefrom, yet the increased tendency to free thought and wide erudition promoted not a little the cause of popular education, so that in the fourth century, and thence on until about the tenth, "Christians applied themselves with greater zeal and diligence to the study of philosophy and the liberal arts. The emperors encouraged a taste for the sciences, and left no means unemployed to excite and maintain a spirit of literary emulation among the professors of Christianity. For this purpose schools were established in many cities, libraries were erected, and men of learning and genius were nobly rec-

ompensed by the honors and advantages that were attached to the culture of the sciences and arts." * It was not until the incursions of the barbarous nations into the western provinces, and the still later supremacy of the papal hierarchy, that ignorant men were elevated to civil and churchly offices, and the cause of popular education began to wane.

But from the time of the Reformation down through three centuries general intelligence has been rapidly and surely gaining ascendency. Every year has developed some progress. Never in the history of the world had the sciences, philosophy, and letters a stronger hold on the hearts and minds of the people, nor a broader sway, than they now have. Whatever a few impracticable leaders in infidel clubs may say to the contrary, it is demonstrable that the present *status* of intelligence, education, and civilization is owing primarily and almost wholly to the inspirations and encouragements of Christianity. So true is this, that not only were the several schools and institutions of learning in all the world founded by Christian men, but the several Protestant Churches in all lands have ever made the founding of schools, the arrangement and classification of rude tongues, the translation of books, and the instruction of the people, among the very first matters of enterprise and labor alike in heathen and nominally Christian countries. They foster the cause of education at home and in newly settled regions.

For the idea of popular education we are indebted primarily to the Hebrews and early Christians. The Chinese and Arabian caliphs, Charlemagne, Alfred, Abelard, and Duns Scotus made large advances in general intelligence. The Lutheran reform, as above stated, gave great impulses to the cause, and made school-teachers honored co-laborers of preachers of the Gospel. The idea of popular instruction was brought to this country by our ancestors in the seventeenth century. Very early Massachusetts and Connecticut made it obligatory on parents to see that their children were taught to read and write, and were instructed in religion and morality. In the history of New England, the names of Ezekiel Cheever, Cotton Mather, Horace Mann, and Henry Barnard stand high as gifted and laborious laborers.†

* Mosheim's "Ecclesiastical History."

† Eugene Lawrence, in "Harper's Magazine," Nov., 1875.

Wishing to show the position and action of the more prominent Churches of this country on this subject, I briefly refer to them. Though after careful inquiry I have been unable to learn that the Congregational Churches have of late, or at any time, given a formal declaration of their sentiment on the subject of popular education, as we indeed might expect in these times; yet, from the long and well-known character and activity of those Churches, from the time of their organization in this country, July 20, 1629, under the general direction of Rev. Mr. Robinson both in England and in Holland, of Elder Brewster, who was a practical printer, of Governor Bradford, Rev. Mr. Skelton, their first pastor at Plymouth, and Mr. Higginson, their formally accepted and honored teacher, no one doubts the position of that denomination in reference to the educational interests of this country. Of Governor Bradford it is said, "he had acquired an excellent education, especially in the languages. He was master of the Dutch tongue, almost as of his vernacular dialect; the French was familiar to him; the Latin and Greek he most diligently studied; but, above all, he was learned in the Hebrew, because, as he said, he would see with his own eyes the ancient oracles of God in their native beauty."*

The original first colonists planted a Church, then a school, and in a few years founded a college as a pattern for the future. Harvard,† and Yale,‡ William and Mary, and Princeton Colleges are outgrowths of their spirit and labors.

In Massachusetts, where the spirit of the first settlers may yet be found, all presidents, professors, and tutors in the colleges, teachers in academies, and all other instructors of youth, were from the beginning required to use their best endeavors to teach the principles of piety, justice, and a sacred regard to truth. The law demands that instructors lead their pupils into a clear understanding of the tendency of these virtues to preserve and perfect a republican constitution, and secure the blessings of lib-

* Journal of the Pilgrims at Plymouth.

† Harvard University began Oct. 26, 1636, in an Act of the General Court of Massachusetts voting £400 for collegiate purposes. In 1638 John Harvard, from whom it is named, made to it a liberal donation of money and books.

‡ The project of a college in the colony of Connecticut took shape as early as the year 1700, when ten Christian ministers met in New Haven and organized for the purpose of founding a college. Incorporated the succeeding year under its present name, from Governor Elihu Yale, the donor of a valuable library, it was, in 1717, permanently located where it now stands.

erty as well as to promote their future happiness. The same principle entered into the laws which were passed in Connecticut as early as 1656; for it was enjoined upon all officers of government to see to it that every child "attain at least so much as to be able to read the Scriptures and other good and profitable books in the English tongue, and in some complete measure to understand the main grounds and principles of the Christian religion."*

The State of New York has an honorable record also. The early Dutch clergy were very commonly school-teachers, and a free school was early founded by the Reformed Dutch Church in the city of New York. As the opinions of the present age may be somewhat guided by a reference to the opinions of some of the leading men who contributed largely to make our country what it is, it may be well to state that as early as 1737, when a bill for appropriations for the maintenance of the public high school was before the colonial Legislature, such men as Livingston, Morris, Schuyler, Alexander, Verplanck, and Rensselaer advocated it. In 1753 William Livingston said, in reference to the founding of King's College:

> The advantages flowing from the rise and improvement of literature are not to be confined to a set of men. They are to extend their cheerful influence through society in general, through the whole province, and, therefore, ought to be the peculiar care of the united body of the Legislature. . . . To enumerate all the advantages accruing to a country from due attention to the encouragement of the means of education is impossible. . . . Knowledge among the people makes them free, enterprising, and dauntless; but ignorance enslaves, emasculates, and depresses them. When men know their rights they will at all hazards defend them, as well against the insidious designs of domestic politicians as the undisguised attacks of a foreign enemy; but while the mind remains involved in its native obscurity it becomes pliable, abject, dastardly, and tame; it swallows the greatest absurdities, submits to the vilest impositions, and follows wherever it is led.†

Prior to 1760, and under the reign of George II., a corporation, known as "The Governors of the College of the Province of New York," was created. At the close of the Revolution, on a petition of the governors of this corporation, the Legislature erected the college into a university, empowered

* "Question of the Hour," by Rev. R. W. Clark, D.D.

† Report of Special Commission of New York State Assembly, 1879.

"to found schools and colleges in any part of the State, as may seem expedient to them." This Board of Regents, as it has since been called, inaugurated the system of common schools "for the purpose of instructing children in the lower branches of education" sufficiently to enable them "to transact the business arising from their daily intercourse with each other."

The foundations of the common-school system in this State were, however, laid in 1795 by Governor George Clinton. In his message to the Legislature he recommended "the establishment of common schools throughout the State." The suggestion was approved, and the sum of $50,000 was set aside, to be divided among the towns and counties in proportion to the number of their electors.* From another source I gather the following provision in 1790:

> The sum of £20,000 shall annually be appropriated for the term of five years for the purpose of encouraging and maintaining schools . . . in which children of the inhabitants residing in the State shall be instructed in the English language, or be taught English grammar, arithmetic, mathematics, and such other branches of knowledge as are most useful and necessary to complete a good English education.†

This is the American idea, an idea that includes all men and is suited to the nature of our republic, as also to the needed qualifications of *all its citizens*. This system of education, modified for the better, remains to this day.

The time of the above-named appropriation expiring in 1800, another impetus was given to the cause of popular education by Jedediah Peck, of Otsego County, Adam Comstock, of Saratoga, and De Witt Clinton, who secured the passage of a bill by the Legislature in 1812, by which the school system was founded. In 1813 Hon. Gideon Hawley was appointed superintendent of public schools, and by his intelligence and energy for eight years brought the standard to a high degree of completeness.‡ In recommending the establishment of common schools in this State, Governor Clinton said: "The advantage to morals, religion, good government, arising from the general

* Report of Special Commission of New York State Assembly, 1879.

† Session Laws, 1795, chap. 75, sec. 1, cited by Prof. J. H. Hoose, Ph.D., in address, 1879.

‡ Eugene Lawrence, "Harper's Magazine," Nov., 1875.

diffusion of knowledge being universally admitted, permit me to recommend this subject to your deliberate attention."

One of the ablest representatives of education * in this State says:

Common schools are the offspring of Protestantism. We can have them because we are not under the dominion of the Pope. He has proved conclusively that Romanism is the enemy of common schools, of popular education in every form. Americans will not, if they are wise, put an institution that they love so much into the hands of its enemies. The glory of our system is universal education; that of Rome is universal ignorance.

Under the patronage of William and Mary, King and Queen of England, and under the general direction of the Episcopalians of Virginia, "William and Mary," the oldest of American colleges except "Harvard," was established nearly two hundred years ago. Chartered in 1693, it has a record of its students, including many of the leading men of this country, from 1720 to the present time. So dear were the educational interests to the colonists of Virginia that steps toward academic and popular instruction were taken as early as 1619, and, though thwarted therein, they continued to labor in behalf of the cause until their hopes were largely realized, and, had it not been for the institution and perpetuation of slavery, their efforts would, doubtless, have equaled those of other old States.† Says Hon. Justin S. Morrill: ‡

The subject of education was not slumbering even in those early days when Washington and Jefferson were prominent friends of both schools and universities, holding them to be indispensable to the success of our American political institutions. The celebrated ordinance of 1787 proclaimed that "schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." This was an ordinance of the whole country, reaffirmed in 1798 by Congress after the adoption of the Constitution, and its obligations must be redeemed by the authority of the whole country, with the proceeds of the territory and property originally dedicated to this high purpose. Schools and the means of education can thus, and only thus, be forever encouraged.

In further evidence of the early educational *animus* of our countrymen, I refer to the beginning and growth of public

* R. W. Clark, D.D., in "The Christian World."

† Report of U. S. Commission of Education, 1872: J. E. Cooke, in "Scribner's Monthly," Nov., 1875.

‡ Speech in Senate of U. S., Dec. 15, 1880.

libraries. As far back as 1652 Hezekiah Usher began and thereafter successfully prosecuted the business of bookselling in Boston, Mass. In 1677 four other persons engaged in the same work there. In 1732 Benjamin Franklin started a subscription library, which he called "the mother of all the North American subscription libraries." In 1747 the Redwood Library was established, at Newport, R. I., by Abraham Redwood, who endowed it by a gift of five hundred pounds. In 1776 there were in the colonies twenty-six public libraries, aggregating about 43,000 volumes, and visited by hundreds of general readers and men of letters.*

The recorded sentiments of the Presbyterian Church may be seen in the following from "the Constitution" thereof, early adopted in this country: "It is recommended that the candidate [for licensure] be required to produce a diploma of Bachelor or Master of Arts from some college or university; or, at least, authentic testimonials of his having gone through a regular course of learning. They shall examine him on the arts and sciences, on theology, natural and revealed, and on ecclesiastical history." † Though this excerpt has but little reference to *popular* education, it shows the educational standard of that cultured Church, and its influence on the minds of the people. What is more significant, the College of New Jersey, now popularly known as "Princeton College," was originated by royal charter in 1746, and, by a more ample charter, it acquired, in 1748, the powers and privileges then held by the higher institutions of Great Britain. "Columbia College," another Presbyterian institution, was established in 1753.‡

Expressive of the views and spirit of the Church which, because it had its origin amid the influences of the highest style of educational forces, is deemed a strong opponent of Romanism and ignorance, as it is a zealous ally and promoter of popular education in this country, I here give outline evidences that no Church takes higher ground as to an educated ministry and an intelligent people than does the Methodist Episcopal. Not only are all candidates for the ministry, whatever their *status* of scholarship, required to pursue a course of study preparatory to licensure and to probation in Conference

* "Harpers' Magazine," 1877, p. 722. † Confession of Faith.

‡ Report U. S. Commission of Education, 1874.

—which is, of course, an incentive in the cause of general education and thorough reforms—but all who desire admission to the full and regular ministry must pass a satisfactory examination on an extensive course of reading and study, running through four years. And now the matter of prescribing a course of post-graduate studies, to be pursued by such as desire, is urged for the sake of greater scholarship and efficiency. As might be expected, these men are required, in their ministerial relations, to give special attention to the instruction of children, and to enjoin the same duty on parents and guardians. And, what is true of no other Church in America, so far as this writer knows, she has incorporated in her "Book of Discipline" a section devoted especially to advices and directions for the higher education of youth. Among them are recommendations that each Conference have an academy or seminary under its direction, that four Conferences unite in the support of a college or university, and, in order that the people may be properly instructed in this matter, it is enjoined that "it shall be the duty of each preacher in charge to preach on the subject of education once a year," and to "take one public collection annually in aid of the work of education."

What strikes us as worthy of still greater commendation, this Church has, by formal resolutions adopted by her chief body, put herself openly and squarely on record in favor of the common schools of this country, in a form and manner that no other Church has done. She has placed herself in antagonism to the enemies of popular education in these few but weighty declarations:

Whereas, We have always, as a Church, accepted the work of education as a duty enjoined by our commission "to teach all nations;" and

Whereas, The system of common schools is an indispensable safeguard to republican institutions; and

Whereas, The combined and persistent assaults of the Romanists endanger the very existence of our common schools; therefore,

Resolved, 1. That we will co-operate in every effort which is fitted to make our common schools more efficient and permanent.

Resolved, 2. That it is our firm conviction that to divide the common-school funds among religious denominations for educational purposes is wrong in principle, and hostile to our free institutions and the cause of education.*

* Journal of General Conference, 1872, p. 441.

To show the agreement to these advanced steps of the representative men officially connected with the educational work in this country, I select the following by the Hon. A. E. Rankin, late Secretary of the Vermont Board of Education, namely:

I suppose it to be a fact that the State took into its own hands the management of the educational interests of its children because it felt that its own permanence and security depended upon the intelligence and virtue of its citizens. And no republican government can long stand if a strong and vigorous moral sentiment be not inculcated into the minds of its people, and the public conscience be not educated and enlightened. The history of the world shows that men devoid of moral principle can only be governed by force. . . . The nations of the Old World have borrowed the common school from us, but several of them have surpassed us in developing the resources of the system. The Prussians have a maxim that whatever you would have appear in a nation's life you must put into the public schools.

Forestalling and encouraging this state of things, the Constitution of the United States provides that, "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to a good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." Accordingly, all our State Constitutions recognize the rights of conscience and the duty of providing for the education of the citizens of the several States. It is an interesting fact that as early as March, 1775, a banner with the inscription "George Rex, and the Liberties of America," and on the reverse side "No Popery," was raised in the city of New York. And we deem it well that the representatives of the Republican party in the State of New York did, at the convention held Sept. 8, 1875, adopt the following resolution:

The free public school is the bulwark of the American Republic. We therefore demand the unqualified maintenance of the public-school system, and its support by equal taxation. We are opposed to all sectarian appropriations, and we denounce as a crime against liberty and republican institutions any project for sectarian division or perversion of the school fund of the State.

In further evidence of the policy of this nation Hon. J. S. Morrill, in support of the bill referred to in the early part of this article, declared that in 1858 he introduced into the national Senate "a bill providing colleges for each of the States," and though, for a special reason, it was vetoed by the President, yet only four years later a similar measure "became the law of

the land." The national aim in this direction is seen also in the establishment of schools for the advancement of agriculture and other industrial arts, as supplementary to and in harmony with classical institutions. He continued:

Universal education diminishes pauperism by opening avenues to labor, and by showing how money can be saved as well as earned. It makes more of social life, and there is less of crime to be supported and punished. It finds nobler fields of ambition than are fields of war, and cherishes human brotherhood. Under our form of government, swayed to and fro by universal suffrage, it becomes our gravest duty as legislators to take heed that all those who wield power at the ballot-box shall be fully informed of the high trust they hold, and of their duty to discharge that trust with fidelity to the whole country and to the sacred obligations of an enlightened conscience. All of our citizens must be raised to that intellectual and moral dignity which appreciates and accepts some personal responsibility to their country for their political privileges and for their appropriate exercise.

The senator declares further that the political and moral interests of the nation can be subserved only as "our school-houses as well as churches shall be wide open even to heathens, if here to stay, rather than our jails and houses of correction." Through immigration we are annually receiving large accessions to our population.

These tidal waves of drifting population will continue to flood our shores as long as men and women are attracted by our free institutions, by free homesteads, by free common schools, and by higher wages. Willing to labor, anxious to learn, as should be this adventurous host of comparative strangers to American institutions, shall we not plant both common schools and colleges among such a raw and relatively uninstructed multitude wherever it may be ultimately distributed?*

Over and above these "foreign legions" from Europe and Asia there are the several Indian tribes, who, as experiment shows, can be educated, civilized, and made useful citizens. "Wards of the nation," they desire to live and work. Unable to educate themselves, and it being impracticable that the States and Territories in which they in greatest numbers have their reservations be to the requisite expense for their education, it becomes necessary that the nation provide the means. The same is true and more urgent in reference to the millions

* Senator Morrill.

of colored people recently set free and suddenly intrusted with a political power for which they are generally unprepared, and for which education and morality alone can prepare them. That this people can be taught and are eager for the rudiments of education is now acknowledged at the South, as it is patent to all. In an address to a delegation of colored citizens General Grant lately said:

I am glad to see in my travels the progress in education all over the country made by the colored people, even in the South, where the prejudice is strongest. It is rare to see a colored child lose an opportunity to get a common-school education. Education is the first great step toward the capacity to exercise the new privileges accorded to you wisely and properly. I hope the field may be open to you, regardless of any prejudice which may have heretofore existed.

At the meeting of the Army of the Tennessee, held at Des Moines, Iowa, 1875, he spoke similarly:

Where no power is exercised except the will of the people it is important that the sovereign people foster intelligence—that intelligence which is to preserve us as a free nation. The centennial year of our national existence is a good time to begin the work of strengthening the foundations of the structure commenced by our patriotic forefathers one hundred years ago. Let us all labor to aid all needful guarantees for the security of free thought, free speech, a free press, pure morals, unfettered religious sentiments, and equal rights and privileges to all men, irrespective of nationality, color, or religion. Encourage free schools, and resolve that not one dollar appropriated for their support shall be appropriated to the support of any sectarian schools; that neither the State nor the nation shall support institutions of learning other than those sufficient to afford to every child in the land the opportunity of a good common-school education, unmixed with sectarian, pagan, or atheistic dogmas.

There is no doubt that the genius of our institutions, having such a marked history, is to be preserved largely by the intelligence and morals of the people through the agency of the public schools of the land. And it becomes us to look well to the character and style of the education we foster and offer to the wards of the several States and of the nation. What should be its chief characteristics is the special subject of the remaining pages of this paper. "That nation is best educated in which knowledge is the most diffused, in which the results of learning are within the grasp of the greatest number." By an

education suited to the masses we understand, therefore, such a leading out, such a teaching and developing of them in general, as will induce a performance of the duties of citizenship. Educated after this model, they cannot be easily subjected to the leadings of corrupt and designing men, but will be somewhat identified with the aims of a free people. General intelligence, a knowledge of men and things, and sound morality, constitute the real worth and usefulness of life. We give it as our settled conviction that they whose character is formed by intelligence and morality scarcely and seldom so far swerve from their early education as to contravene the grander purposes and duties of life.

This style of an education, fitting the people to their places, should be given to *all the wards* of this country. The provisions for what is called "compulsory education" should be earnestly and universally enforced. The children of foreigners among us, and our colored citizens, should share the educational as they do the political advantages of the nation. It is somewhat remarkable that not until after the first century of our national history are any enlarged educational advantages surely, though slowly, being offered to the freedmen of the South and to their race at the North. Under the inspiration and direction of Northern Churches and other benevolent societies, schools of all grades are being established. And the time will come when our colored citizens will proudly look back to the origin of the institutions that now rise for their enlightenment, as do the descendants of the colonists to our oldest colleges. The characteristics of sires are naturally somewhat reproduced in the ground-features of their offspring. As the solid strength of the Abrahamic and Anglo-Saxon races is found again in the genius and force of their descendants, so it will be in the citizens of this republic.

What are the chief ways and means of securing to the people this style of education? The early and late history of this republic, as we have in this paper outlined it, teaches that the universal education of the people, under the supervision of competent authority, is the only wise method, provided always that family and Christian instruction be given. This well-established fact brings us, unfortunately, into antagonism with religious bigotry and sectarian or ecclesiastical ignorance. It

is only by the ascendency and maintenance of our Protestant and democratic institutions that these combined forces can be controlled or kept in check. "The triumph of one is the overthrow of the other. The modern Latin races, with their ignorant and superstitious people, their monks, relics, and shams, are rapidly sinking to decay, as is seen in Italy, France, Spain, Portugal, Austria, in Europe; in South America, and especially in Mexico, on our borders." * The Roman Catholic Irish seem to hold with greater tenacity to superstition and ignorance than do any other people that are in commercial intercourse with Protestant and intelligent countries. Our chief safeguard, therefore, lies in universal education under the sanctions of vital Christianity. And though it be a difficult thing to secure a strong hold or wide influence over this people, we may and should guard against them. Just now they are making persistent and special efforts to gain both power and numbers in the South. They are there organizing schools and Churches for the unsophisticated and easily moved freedmen—a people who, if left to their own choice, would more naturally go to the schools, churches, and other associations of their deliverers from bondage, and yet who, because of the intrigues of political ecclesiastics, may be so blinded and misled as to be perverted from the established institutions of the country. The freedmen take to education, to art, and to religion with an avidity and success highly gratifying and encouraging. Some are turning their attention to the learned professions. Give to them, as they desire, all the rights and privileges of citizens, and in a generation of time they will show themselves worthy their nationality. Our danger is less from them than from quite another people. European Communists, Roman Catholic zealots, and corrupt politicians, who openly show themselves inimical to popular education, as provided in our grand system of common schools, are the people to be guarded against. Our obvious duty, therefore, is to look wisely to the prevalent influences of our educational facilities.

First among these are our common schools. From the nature of things these are a vast power. They are adapted to promote the intelligence of the citizens, and to fit them for their several duties. They are not "godless," as is affirmed by

* Froude.

some persons. The genius of our country, from its beginning, forbids it. A Christian atmosphere pervades the thinking, the literature, and the history of the guiding minds. The results are seen in the broad currents of religious thought, superior to the eddies that play on the surface. It is otherwise in papal countries. Even in Great Britain primary schools are less suited to promote general intelligence, enlarged freedom of thought, and a broad and uniform civilization, because they are chiefly parochial and denominational, than in this country. They foster the spirit of caste, against which Mr. Gladstone, in his attacks on papal ignorance and priestly domination, is dealing heavy blows. But the early history of our people, the extent of this country, the genius of its founders, are promotive of large ideas, general intelligence, and a wide-awake enterprise. Our institutions give to this nation a prominence that attracts representatives of the Orient here for the special purpose of studying our chief peculiarities, not the least of which are our institutions of learning, from the lowest to the highest. An education that is worthy the name is practical, intelligently and broadly so. The good sense and strong qualities, as of those who rise from rustic childhood to elevated and honorable positions of trust and power, aided by the instruction and discipline given in our common schools, are of more value in this country than are the ignorance and effete customs of the Old World.

But the strongest conservative force and chief element of an enduring civilization are the religious. Say what any body may, a Christian education is the ground element in a republican form of government. It should be begun and fostered in the homes of the people. Without detriment to secular education it should be a pervading force in all our schools. Without it no morality, no civilization, no culture, reaches sufficiently deep or high, nor lasts sufficiently long, to contribute much to the value of citizenship. The pulpit and school-room, the home and press, should be at one in promoting this style of education among the people. Our honored fathers did it; we should do it. "Every government, to say nothing of Churches, is bound to enforce education on every child. It ought to put the ballot-box behind every school-house, so that when a child comes to vote it shall do so through the school-

house." * Leon Gambetta, of France, said to President Thiers: "The salvation of France depends on the adoption of a thorough system of obligatory education." When this condition of things, both secular and religious, shall become general in this country, then its liberties will be secured, and the powers of ignorance, ecclesiastical intrigue, and European rationalism brought to America, will be held in harmless abeyance or subjection. And did the people of these United States understand and realize how persistent are the efforts of the many and subtle enemies of sound intelligence, pure morals, and universal education among us, they would hasten, we think, to guard against the danger, to strengthen and extend the appliances for which we here plead.

Believing what we have thus far said to be eminently true, particularly in reference to this country, where every citizen who holds the elective franchise is thereby an individual sovereign, a veritable factor in government, it seems of the utmost importance that they each and all be sufficiently educated to understandingly perform the duties of citizenship. We Americans are particularly proud of our State or national system of common schools, by which all the children may be so educated as to become intelligent citizens, capable of understandingly exercising the elective franchise.

If there is one thing which they are prouder of than another it is their national schools. The Roman Catholics do not like these schools. They insist on educating their own children; they intend, if they can, to apply the education vote to a denominational purpose, and in New York, and possibly in Boston itself, their numbers give them a chance of success. Nor is this the worst. In America, as in England and Scotland, they are making converts out of the Protestant communions. Weak, imaginative people, disturbed by theological controversies, are imposed on by the pretensions of a Church which sits so calmly in the midst of the confusion and claims exclusive possession of truth. . . . The Roman Catholic peasantry, who have flowed over into America, are poor, ignorant creatures, who care nothing for the Constitution, whose interests, so far as they have any, are in Ireland and in their creed, and who vote as their priests direct them. Why should such vices be allowed to exercise a preponderating influence in the American nation? "Universal suffrage," just now, is the American sovereign. †

* Rev. H. W. Beecher.

† Froude, in "North American Review," Oct., 1879.

This being a fact which cannot be reversed, it is of the utmost importance that the compulsory feature of the laws in some States be so carried out as that every child of school age shall receive a fair common-school education, such as is suited to the genius of our institutions. The distinctions of race should in these things be lost. Both native-born and foreign-born should, we think, be required to be able to read sufficiently to understand the duties of citizenship and what is involved in allegiance to government. Though the freedmen of the South are no longer regarded nor treated as "wards of the nation," much less of the several States within which they live, yet it does seem an imperative duty, as also a wise and sound policy, that the several States make the same provisions for their education, and also for that of enfranchised Indians, which they make for whites. And no doubt the Southern States can and should do more for popular education within their own bounds than they either have done or are now doing. For the education of freedmen the Churches at the South are doing very little, because they are influenced by political and caste prejudices. The public schools in which colored children can be educated are few, poor, and inefficient. The most that is being done is by the Churches and philanthropists of the North, and that chiefly for the education of those who design to serve as teachers or preachers.*

Without going here into the statistics, which are often given and generally known, it is clear, from the history of all republics, ancient and modern, and from the history of Churches as well, that a certain amount of knowledge, a certain degree of education, and, above all, of Christian morality, are absolutely necessary to the perpetuity and well-being of these United States.

It is, doubtless, true that many persons think or fear that universal suffrage is a mistake, and that because of it our nation must eventually yield to the influences of ignorance, luxury, and anarchy, which have destroyed other republics. Whether or not such fears are well grounded depends much on the character of the people. Popular suffrage is in this country a fixed fact from which there will be no receding, and it remains an imperative duty that intelligence, education, and good morals be also universal; else the suffrage should be restricted to

* Rev. Dr. Hartzell, "Methodist Quarterly Review," Oct., 1879, pp. 742–744.

certain qualifications, educational or property-possessing. The elements of danger must be somehow neutralized, a thing which can be done best by making a Christian education open to all and obligatory upon all.* Property qualification may be well. But, because of genius and skill, because of shrewdness and rigid economy, some men, who are both ignorant and wicked, dishonest and fraudulent, may be and often are freeholders. The being a taxable freeholder is, therefore, no further an indication of a fitness for all the rights and privileges of citizenship in a republic than being personally interested in the protection and control of property. But the rights and suffrages of a citizen are more than the rights and privileges of a man as man. Rapidly accumulating facts in reference to the multitude of foreign-born who are naturalized citizens, and in reference to an equal number of home-born and enfranchised freedmen, show that such a homogeneousness of character and condition, of rights and privileges, and of restrictions and control, as a Christian education gives, is necessary in order to the maintenance of the characteristic elements and features of this nation.

In bringing this paper to a close we cannot do better than to use the short and crisp address made by ex-President Grant at San Francisco, after his return from his tour of the world, and on the occasion of the reception given to him by the Board of Education and the children of the public schools of that city:

It is a gratifying sight to witness this evidence of the educational privileges afforded by this young city. The crowds gathered inside and outside this building indicate that every child of an age fit for school is provided for. When education is generally diffused, we may feel assured of the permanency and perpetuity of our institutions. The greatest danger of our people grows out of ignorance, and this evidence of the universality of education is the best guarantee of our loyalty to American principles.

* Report of Commission of New York State Assembly on Normal Schools, 1870.

Art. IV.—CHRIST AND OUR CENTURY.

The invisible Christ confronts our day as the same intense reality that Christ visible presented to his countrymen eighteen hundred years ago. At that time he was to many a beautiful enigma, a perplexity of wonder and awe, but yet one who, despite of intellect unsatisfied and yearnings disappointed, kept a firm hold on love and adoration. No love was ever so sorely tried, no adoration so often driven by stress of circumstances to vindicate its tenacious fervor; and for three years this new pulse of life swelled and contracted, throbbed and quivered, under the pressure of that sort of uncertainty which is a providential element in our highest education. To others this mysterious stranger was an object of doubt and distrust. Not a few believed, or pretended to believe, that he was a deceiver, who was in league with "Beelzebub, the prince of devils." So, then, from the outset there was "a division among the people." The dividing line, at first faint and indistinct, became clearer. It grew broad and well-defined, until at last it was traced in ineffaceable blood. On the one side or other of this line men are still arrayed; and though Christ is hidden from the senses, he is none the less, but indeed all the more, the Christ of the Father to our instincts, whom each one has to accept or reject. This act of accepting or rejecting Christ is the most important a human being can perform. It determines his character, as estimated by the eternal ideal of character. It gathers into oneness all the issues of responsibility pertaining to his nature, endowments, and opportunities. Nay, more, it reaches beyond the individual, and, accordingly, when we speak of "Christ and our century," we refer to an interest which includes the family, the nation, and the race, and hence is supreme in its momentousness.

The earliest attitude in which we see Christianity is sublime. Before the Lord Jesus had a disciple or had attracted the least notice, he had a perfectly defined gospel, a religion of "glad tidings," a religion in its threefold aspect of "glory to God," "on earth peace," "good-will toward men;" and this system lay within his mind as to its precise scope and exact details just as it is in our day. Man's art is seen clearly enough in efforts

to modify its character and subject it to adaptations other than its divine Founder contemplated. This is in keeping with man's nature. And, furthermore, we may believe that Providence permitted this to occur, so that the imprint of the human hand might appear in startling contrast with the hand of Christ. When critics like Dennis and Warburton undertake to improve Shakspeare, the only effect on sensible men is to heighten the estimate of the dramatist's genius. Far more do we feel the folly of Platonists, ascetics, mystics, when they try to shape Christianity according to human fantasies of religion. In nothing has the intellect been more prolific than in this sort of ingenious conceit; and to what has it amounted? Only to a fuller disclosure of the instinctive symmetry of Christianity as it came from Christ. Its original form is its true form. And it was in this form—simple, unbefriended by worldly alliances, free from derogatory associations—that it rested calmly and prophetically on its own might. It saw the end from the beginning, because the one contained the other. Understand, then, that Christianity never proposed to adapt itself to man, but to adapt man to itself. Light is older than the eye. The eye was constructed to suit the light. Man was created for Christ, and hence Christ's religion was designed to fulfill the purpose of his creation by means of redemption. If so, then, this religion, because of its lofty ideal, would deal with man not as a mere inhabitant of the earth, but as a citizen of the universe. Much that it had to say to him would be only understood in part. The very dignity it put upon him would be turned against itself, while not a few of its worst enmities would spring from the fact that it treated him as "a little lower than the angels." Nay, more; just as the insane are often more violent against their nearest friends than against strangers, how could it be otherwise than that its extreme opponents should seek to rid the earth of its presence? Yet, in the certain prospect of all this, Christianity came forth from the provincial seclusions of Nazareth and challenged the homage of the foremost races of the world. It did this of choice. A prominent feature of its plan, from the first, was to touch the highest in man. And whereas all education and culture in other matters begin in the lowest connections of intellect with the senses, proceeding from the material to the sensuous, and thence in-

wardly to the imaginative and the reflective, it evoked at once the loftiest sentiments on the assumption that there was "a spirit in man," and "the inspiration of the Almighty" gave it "understanding." Therefore our statement that in the outset of its course the attitude of Christianity was sublime.

In entire consistency with this aim, we find the Lord Jesus opening his ministry by conversations with Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, and soon thereafter with a woman of Samaria. Nationality and non-nationality are side by side. Immediately succeeding these incidents we see him working miracles in behalf of a Jewish nobleman's son and a Roman centurion's servant. Nationality and non-nationality emerge again into notice. Extremes in society are brought together, and the new rain from the rising cloud of mercy falls alike "on the evil and on the good." The best in each is addressed. Nicodemus is aroused by an appeal to his official position, the woman of Sychar by the quickening of her sensibilities, the nobleman by access to a father's heart, and the centurion by sympathy with his servant. The grouping around him goes on. Day by day witnesses an enlarging sphere, of which he is the center. The magnetic power moves freely and has no stoppage. Men hasten to him by instinct, and instinct in them is met by the utmost spontaneousness in him. Among the poor, the wretched, the outcast, his work chiefly lies, and this because suffering and sorrow open the shortest path to what is noblest in humanity. Whence came in no long time discussion, crimination, fierce hostility? For the most part from scribes and Pharisees, men of learning and influence, whose pride of intellect and vanity of office arrayed them against him. Intellect, unregulated by something higher, always tends to return into the senses, and to experience again, and even more fully, the sensations in which it had its birth; and intellect in Christ's day was sensational in its worst form. Three hundred years later, when Julian, who was no common statesman and philosophic thinker, opposed Christianity because it was not a philosophy to the intellect, but a faith to the heart, he followed the bias of all culture when it concentrates manhood in itself. Christ proposed to satisfy the intellect by means of the affections and through the avenues of the spiritual instincts. These were more open in the "common people" than in the cultivated class, and, therefore,

most of his ministry was given to them, for "they heard him gladly."

Whatever may be said against certain current forms of Christianity, A. D. 1881, it cannot be affirmed that Christianity itself has lost its original attitude of sublimity. It still speaks as of old to the primal instincts of the human spirit, and wherever it has foothold it has it on that ground and on none other. Christ in our century is the Christ of Bethlehem, Nazareth, and Galilee, and if he is anywhere "crucified afresh," it is in our metropolitan Jerusalems, that want a secular Messiah, and will have him only. The conditions of the question, "What think ye of Christ?" are not changed a whit. Admit all that is claimed for the material progress of civilization, nevertheless the fact stands that man has not added, by modern growth, a single instinct or any other kind of moral capacity to the old constitution of his nature. What we have done by science, art, literature, and political economy, has been development, not creation; and, moreover, most of the development has been in the interest of the sense-intellect and its gratifications. It has been education in its literal meaning of drawing out, not of adding to, the human mind. Characteristics of men, not of man, have altered. And while our definitions of trade, industry, government, have been re-written to suit modern ideas, the two changeless words in our dictionary are Christ and Man. So will they remain. For these are not liable to the reversals of experience nor to the revisals of more acute observation, but dwell above the fluctuations of the atmosphere, and, by virtue of hidden contact, have fast hold of the unseen and eternal.

Christ and man stand, then, precisely in the same relation that they did eighteen centuries ago, and they have been no more affected by time than the relative positions of the sun and the earth. Christ in our century is the Christ of the New Testament. Man in our century is the man of the New Testament. As then, so at present, they are face to face. Now, if any thing in Christ's life is clear it is that he put away from himself whatever might come between him and man. We know what these intervening objects are. Family blood, hereditary traditions, wealth, fastidious tastes, class habits, are insulators that hinder the free passage of the soul-current of

humanity from one to another. On the other hand, also, poverty, ignorance, and social insensibility are separators between man and man. Were these ever greater than in Christ's time? Was the distance between patrician and plebeian, between Pharisee and the "common people," ever more marked than in his day? From all such distinctions Christ held himself habitually aloof. He was not educated as an ordinary Jewish boy. He was constantly at variance with Sadducean civilization and Pharisaic religionism; and where he conformed to Judaism it was that of the pure Hebrew type, which we have instances of in the way he observed the sanctity of the Sabbath and the memorial feasts of his country. Obviously, this mode of life was not with him an accident. Circumstances did not shape its unique configuration. It was cast in the mold of the Virgin Mother's womb. And, accordingly, when he took his place, at thirty years of age, in the open world, the organic law of his being continued its omnipotent activity in fashioning every external fact of his life in correspondence with his interior nature. Thus it was that he came directly to the heart of man. All obstructions of birth, rearing, culture, conventional usages, having been kept out of his way, the access to human instincts was free and unimpeded. Is it less so now? If it be less, it is the fault of our century.

But before we inquire how far the century is blameworthy in this matter, let us look at the typical manhood that the Lord Jesus created in the midst of a civilization which had interblended Hebrew, Greek, and Roman constituents. The first fact to meet us is that the new type did not appear in his own earthly life-time. When he died on the cross, not a single individual on earth, not the beloved John, not his own mother, understood him. A strange period of forty days intervened between his resurrection and ascension. The marvelous biography that had recorded his incarnation, career, death, resumes its task without a pause. There is no explanation, no apology, no surprise, when the dead Christ re-appears and enters again on his work of instruction and tender fellowship with his disciples. The disciples themselves were amazed at his return, but the evangelists take pains to show that their amazement was due to forgetfulness of his words. On human grounds, such an act of intellectual daring as resuscitating a

teacher and completing his teaching ought to be deemed an impossibility. On the ground of Christianity, it is simple and plain enough. The death and resurrection of Christ were essential facts in the system, and he exemplified the facts while he unfolded the infinite truths which they contained. And in this semi-glorified state he was a Christ to the senses no longer after the former method of his existence, but "showed himself" at intervals, and was a Christ to the spirit. Its distinct characteristic was that of a *quasi*-spiritual dispensation. Pentecost was near by, and these forty days were the prelude to its wonders. Pentecost came, and this typical manhood, which had passed through its three stages of training under the Christ of Nazareth, the Christ of the forty days, and the Christ of the throne, reached its development.

And how humanly philosophic, in the light of inspiration, this method was! And how beautiful in that beauty which imagination, in its moments of deepest truthfulness, sees as far remote from earthly modes of thought and yet nearer than any thing earthly to the spirit's profoundest instincts! Putting out of view its religious significance and taking it as an intellectual method, we can conceive of nothing better calculated to give us what we so much need in this age, a clear insight into the laws of mind. Here we have "God manifest in the flesh." The same organs of observation are exercised as in daily life. People are "astonished" and even "amazed." This is human experience. Yet while the wonders are occurring, a directive power is noticeable, and its aim is uniform. Over every miracle a sovereignty is enthroned. The power acts, but the sovereignty acts also. The beneficence effects a certain end, and, at the same instant, the sovereignty asserts its control. The miracle is not a spectacle for the senses. It is not an excitement for the imagination and its co-related emotions. Instead of these, it makes its way toward the reflective intellect, nor does it stop there, but advances into the moral nature. Beyond doubt, it seeks the conscience and affections, and the enforcement which the sovereignty gives is not content till its force appears in conviction and sentiment.

Is not this the very ideal of the true method of thought? Add to it the further development of the forty days and of Pentecost, and what faculty has been unawakened? what func-

tion of a faculty unquickened? what recess of the hidden soul unvisited? what latency of the progressive spirit untouched? No problem connected with the management of mind was ever so complex and difficult as that which Christ had to consider, namely, *how the human soul could be taught and trained through the senses for the spiritual realization of God.* Eighteen centuries have shown us nothing which he did not know and act upon in shaping the typical manhood to which we have referred. Is it a law of mind that the two co-existent elements of perception and sensation are always in an inverse proportion? Most fully did he recognize it. Throughout his career his miracles were quiet, unobtrusive, and prefaced by a tranquillizing influence. Is it a law of mind that feeling should be calm in order to give a continuous support to intellectual energy? Without an exception, he observed this principle. Is it a law of mind that impressions should be repeated and that the mind itself should recall them so that the brain may educate the senses as well as the senses educate the brain? This was Christ's invariable course. Is it a law of mind that impressions due to external causes should recede in process of completion from perception to reflection, and thence inward till the whole nature has been traversed? And, meantime, is the imagination ever busy as a mediating force, harmonizing the faculties in their reciprocal activities no less than in adjusting sense and spirit in their mutuality? Take the Sermon on the Mount, the sermon recorded in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, and the farewell discourse, and you see Christ's recognition of these laws of thought.

It is the highest, the most august, the most sacred recognition which these laws ever received. It cannot be identified with any thing Hebrew, Greek, or Roman. It is distinctively Christ's method. No one ever suspected that these laws existed in the human mind until he appealed to them, and by the appeal made men conscious of their existence. For instance, when Christ "*showed*" himself on the second Sunday night after the resurrection to the disciples, did St. Thomas imagine that there was such a law of belief as that on which he now acted? Discarding his own philosophy of evidence, which he was challenged to put in practice, he instantly exclaimed, "My Lord and my God." The instincts of his heart were reached,

and, in spite of his recent self, unbelief was changed to worship. Now, what we urge is that the philosophy of the mind, which Christ originated as a method of thinking and incorporated into a permanent system, is the philosophy that has the deepest roots in our century. It was this philosophy that in the first quarter of our century led the tremendous reaction against the French Revolution and has steadily advanced in its achievements.

Without doubt, our times have some very painful aspects. Vast numbers seem to be living in a world given over to the senses. Materialism never had such opportunities to gratify its myriad propensities. Myriad verily they are, and the modern world has grown big enough to give them ample scope. Infidelity has its powerful auxiliaries in science, literature, and politics, as these are taught and enforced by men whose talents and learning, along with their positions, secure them public attention. But what is the source of power in these auxiliaries? Not in themselves certainly, but in their connections with a stage of civilization and a transitional period of education that have thrown around them an air of importance. The importance is fictitious, not real; it is ephemeral, not permanent. Nearly all these questions have grown up on the physical side of our nature, and they are part and parcel of physical development. So, too, neuralgia has been greatly increased in the recent progress of civilization; nerves and brain have become far more sensitive; thousands of tiny fibers, once too insignificant to play any *rôle* in life, have assumed a sudden importance in the animal economy, so that now we can hardly have an eager thought or a fervent desire or an anxious care without the nervous system being more or less tortured. But the spread of neuralgia does not alarm us in behalf of Christianity, and why should Darwinism, physiology, and the data of ethics? The latter are just as much the effect of physical civilization in our day as neuralgia, only differing in this, that in the latter the nervous structure has been implicated, whereas in the former the mind has taken cognizance of certain phenomena and theorized about them in the mood of the times.

Let us not be misunderstood. We do not say that these questions are on the same level with neuralgia. What we do

say is, that they are the products of a material civilization, which, owing to various causes, has lately had a rapid and extensive augmentation of its forces. They have not sprung from the mind itself. No instinct of the soul called for them. They met no want of reason or conscience. Our relations spiritually to God, morally to man, had nothing to do with their origin. On the contrary, the animal man is the only party interested in their discussion. And we admit that this is an interest, because it is desirable to have exact ideas of man's place in the physical universe. At the same time we protest against the folly and evil of importing them from their native region into a domain where they do not belong. Starting from man's consciousness that he is a thinking, willing, and responsible being, and that this consciousness under the light of Christianity contrasts itself as an infinitude of evidence between his higher nature and the lower animality by which he is related to the outward economy of things, we may very advantageously inquire into man's connections with the physical universe. This great branch of scientific investigation has been neglected long enough, and we are now suffering the penalty of neglect. Our punishment has come in the natural order of events and under the authenticating seal of providence. Yet, nevertheless, there is a right way to pursue this inquiry and a wrong way. The wrong way seems just now to be in the ascendant. And the result is, the animal man is uppermost; and what essays he writes for magazines and reviews, what lectures he delivers, what poems and novels he creates! And what a fine creature this animal man is with the mimetic parrot, the noisy jay-bird, the stealthy snake, the royal lion, perfected in him.

This is one aspect of our century. For the first time in the history of the race, we have an approximation to the ideal of an animal man. Epicurus had the disabilities of heathendom. Horace lacked earnestness. Lucretius had to do much of his own thinking. Nero was a brute. Montaigne was a provisional doubter. Hume retired into the shades of metaphysics to indulge his subtle skepticism. Voltaire wrote with a gold ring from royalty, and Rousseau was a sentimentalist, "aweary of the world." But in the long run Time gives every thing a fair chance, and Time has been just to the animal man. And this animal man has reached—so we may suppose—his devel-

opment in our century, and wears the panoply of perfected power. He is not a sensual being. He is in no respect low and vulgar. Though made "of the earth" and therefore "earthy," he has been well made out of unparadised dust, and even the touches of soft hands, such hands as Miss Martineau's, Miss Bevington's, and George Eliot's, are traceable in his fashioning. In brief, he is the animal man, as the opposite of the spiritual man. If you recall Christ's typical man, as completed at Pentecost, and set this other typical man beside him, the breadth of contrast appears. Christ's typical man was like Christ. One of the first things he did was to imitate him by healing the lame man at the beautiful gate of the temple. A grand model is a grand inspiration, and the typical man of Christianity, appearing in one aspect in the impulsive heartiness of St. Peter, in another in the benignity and insight of St. John, in yet another in the sublimity of St. Paul, strove to conform to his model. But where is the model of this animal man? And what is it? A modern Plato could not find it among his archetypes.

Beneath all this, however, may not Providence be working in behalf of Christianity? The relations of man to the material universe, and through it to Almighty God as the maker, preserver, orderer of all things, as we have said, have been strangely neglected. Beyond question, the human race in Christian lands has reached a point in its advancement at which a much more liberal and comprehensive philosophy of our physical attitude and its connections is greatly needed. Stomach, blood, nerves, brain, mean a good deal more now than ever before. Social vices, and especially the sins of great cities, make an urgent appeal for consideration. Philanthropy requires a broader basis of activity. Above all, men have to be told what a common tenantry of the globe means, and how far-reaching sectionality and inter-nationality are with regard to race-unity. Pause a moment, and consider what an immense gain would accrue to education, and thereby to the interests of knowledge, if we had a mental physiology which would command general assent on the ground of ascertained facts. Metaphysics would then have its complementary science, or, rather, the two together would furnish a science of mind. How many religious disputes would such a science settle! Calvinism and

Arminianism run down their tap-roots into laws of the mind. So do Ritualism and Quakerism. Nor is it too much to say that Romanism and Protestantism rest on essential differences in intellectual philosophy. Let us not be thought extravagant if we affirm that a true system of mental philosophy, acknowledging the spirituality of the mind while approaching the study of it through the body, would make such a work as President Edwards' "Inquiry into the Freedom of the Will" as impossible as Mr. Buckle's "History of Civilization." For aught we know, Christianity may now be silently preparing to recover for itself the ground which an atheistic or a mere theistic scheme of philosophy is laboring to acquire. Providence has a vast force of miscellaneous workers, each set heedless of others, often self-absorbed, still oftener antagonistic, and the noisy Babel goes on with its confusion of tongues till Pentecost comes and every man hears in the tongue wherein he has been born "the wonderful works of God." Pentecost, thanks to God, is the ideal end of Babel!

Turn now to another view of this question. Many tell us that Christianity is "*moribund*." By what method of thought do they reach the alarming conclusion? They speak of the decay of reverence, of the wide unloosing of moral ties, of the want of respect for authority, and particularly the authority of public opinion, of the debauchery of national morality by the prostration of national conscience, and of the loss of the old beliefs. On this foundation they rest their convictions and announce the impending fate of Christianity. But it is no foundation at all. Jesus Christ our Lord did not build on any such basis, and, consequently, it is no basis for a criticism on the fortunes and historic prospects of his religion. Surely we should ask an artist in what light he meant his picture to be seen. Michael Angelo had a certain idea in his mind when he swung the dome over St. Peter's, and we ought to understand it. Shakspeare violated his usual method of dramatization when he wrote the "Julius Cæsar," and we should know the reason thereof before presuming to criticise the tragedy. In the instance of Christianity we are under yet more stringent obligations to get the right stand-point as preliminary to a true method of thinking. It professes to be a divine religion. By that standard of judgment it must be tried. Instead of this,

our prophets of evil take the unpromising appearances on the surface of society, and form their conclusions. They are prophets of the eye. Prophets of the eye may do for the weather, but they are not trustworthy in matters touching Christianity. Long ago a great prophet yielded to his eye, and, sinking under the weak tyranny, cried out: "I, even I only, am left." But in that disheartening day there were "seven thousand in Israel" who had not bowed unto Baal. At such a time "seven thousand" were enough to re-stock a depleted empire.

Among the depreciating critics of Christianity in our day Mr. James Anthony Froude is prominent. One of his genius, backed up by an intrepid spirit, always commands attention. His temperament is that of a warrior, his intellect that of a scholar, while his habit of thought is that of a student of affairs. Yet his mind runs in a groove of contrast, and beneath this energetic sense of contrast lies a theory of "Progress," always on the alert to show itself, and always imperious in its narrow logic. He falls into an antithesis as easily as Shakespeare's Brutus at Cæsar's funeral, and without the excuse of Brutus, who had really nothing to say. Mr. Froude has much to say, and he says it with uncommon force. With him the present is always antithetic to the past. Now, it is well enough to compare the past with the present, but better to have an ideal of the future when we would estimate the present. Rarely does it happen that a man can have his ideal in the past and not be its partisan. Sometimes, too, we find it necessary to be independent of our higher self, lest the subtlety of prejudice conquer us unawares. But Mr. Froude, honest and lofty-minded as he is, never detaches a favorite conception, like the "days of yore," from his intellect, and looks at it as something foreign. When he writes the "sketch" of Cæsar he shows statesmanship and learning. Neither Merivale nor Mommsen is his equal in vividness, in ease of grouping, and in strength of effect. Yet when he portrays Bunyan, while he displays very keen discernment of what may be called the intellectual philosophy of his marvelous experience, he fails to comprehend that deeper psychology in which the essence of his subject is contained. Under all the disguises of the seventeenth century, Bunyan was a precursor of the religious spirit

of our century. He was nearer our times than his own. The tender heart of humanity in "Pilgrim's Progress," escaping the trammels of creeds and confessions and vindicating our primal instincts, lifted him above the Puritanism of his period, and signalized the forthcoming era of Christian sentiment as the beautiful efflorescence of Christian principle. But this is precisely what Mr. Froude was unable to see. To illustrate this, we have only to give a remark of his when contrasting Bunyan's intensity of religious emotion with that of our day: "Conviction of sin has become a conventional phrase, shallow and ineffective even in those who use it most sincerely." This is downright extravagance. Thousands of men in our times have had just as searching and overpowering "conviction of sin" as the Bedfordshire tinker, only their sensational nerves were not as much disturbed as his, nor did they have his extraordinary genius to express it in images like those that leaped from the hot furnace of his heart.

Another of these sharp critics of the age is Mr. Ruskin. Of his sympathy with truth and goodness no man can have a doubt. Reverence for God, personal devotion to Christ's service, human love for human interests, are qualities so thoroughly intermixed with his nature as to come forth on all occasions. He cannot criticise a painting, describe a landscape, quote a stanza from Scott or Wordsworth, without his soul showing itself in some utterance of love and veneration beyond the object in question. Within the last forty years his services to Anglo-Saxon thought have been invaluable. And they have been so not simply because of knowledge imparted, and that, too, of a quality extremely scarce in books, but by reason of a personal spirit, quick to penetrate and pungent enough to stimulate one's faculties. One feels called, under his strong words, to be an observer of nature and a critic of art. The man always gets in front of the author, and at times throws back such a heavy shadow that the author quite disappears. Beauty never had a more devout expounder than he. The expounder is philosopher, poet, preacher, all in one. When we add that he occasionally puts on the old Hebrew prophet, and denounces from behind the shaggy mantle and the leather girdle, we mention what, in his complement of characters, never loses a chance to display itself in a fierce climax.

Hooker was a passion with Mr. Ruskin's early manhood, and he has imitated the great ecclesiastical thinker not a little—his judiciousness excepted. Jeremy Taylor comes back to us in him, on the whole, much improved. He has somewhat of Coleridge's amplitude of discursiveness, but he is pretty sure to keep his subject in sight, and also his reader—a virtue that Coleridge despised. Yet, most of all, he is John Ruskin, intellectually brave to the verge of romance, always ready, by step or stride or leap, to get in advance of his age, and loftily indifferent whether or not he has any following. While he has been one of the noblest teachers of righteousness this century has bred, he has been an apostle of art, and of art in its true sense and best uses. No man ever did a tithe of the work he has accomplished in showing the vital union between beauty and purity, and in this—the leading function of his life—his efforts command universal respect and gratitude. "Consider the lilies;" how well he has done it! Of all the commentators on Christ's Gospel he has gone most to the original objects, to the field and forest and mountain, and reverently pointed out where the Lord of nature laid his hand and left his smile. The remark of Isaac Taylor, that Nature, by her "diversities, her gay adornments, and copious fund of forms," allures the eye of man to draw him on to "the more arduous but more noble pursuit of her hidden analogies," he has illustrated with a scope of originality and a plenitude of resources uncommon among men who have trod the higher walks of genius.

Yet, with all his fine endowments, Mr. Ruskin has an unusual share of the frailty that depreciates the religious earnestness of our century. How a man like him can produce volume after volume with scarcely a warm word of commendation for the age is a mystery. In the "Modern Painters" the divine earnestness of the old masters is eulogized well-nigh to extravagance. Recently, however, his eye seems to have been busy finding morbid flesh for cauterization. If we have not had enough of this infirmity of talent in Thackeray and the later George Eliot, the Anglo-Saxon capacity to stand an attempted flaying is a charming testimony to the protecting mercy of its skin. Ridicule and sarcasm, as commonly used, are born of the lower nature of authors, and act on the lower nature of readers. They are of the animal intellect, refined

forms of the sting of the wasp and the fang of the snake. Unquestionably, it is sometimes necessary to employ them. But to make it a business to exercise art and ingenuity in this way is to wound, not to heal, to be smart not to be wise, to corrupt, not to purify. Mr. Ruskin, in his "Fors" and in the discussions on the Lord's Prayer, is full of fault-finding. Nay, more, he is often harshly censorious. It was a beautiful thing in him to write of "Moderation" as the "girdle and safeguard of all the attributes;" but, had he exemplified it a little more in his personal example, the lesson would have had its beauty enhanced. Writing of the life of the Middle Ages, he says that "it was interwoven with white and purple," while "ours is one seamless stuff of brown. . . . The profoundest reason of this darkness of heart is, I believe, our want of faith. There never yet was a generation of men (savage or civilized) who, taken as a body, so woefully fulfilled the words 'having no hope, and without God in the world.' A red Indian or Otaheitan savage has more sense of a Divine existence round him or government over him than the plurality of refined Londoners and Parisians." This is a masterpiece in the annals of literary dogmatism.

Others have written in the same strain. We cannot but regard it as utterly erroneous. Christianity is not "*moribund*," but is doing its work quite as fast and quite as well as could be looked for in a generation like ours. The evil in the world is confessedly gigantic. We see and know it. In an advancing civilization evil comes with great facility to the surface, and, relatively to the amount, the eyes that notice and the tongues that report it have very largely increased. How bad the world is the newspapers keep us well posted every morning. How good it is we are not quite as well informed. Outward life of all sorts is excessively demonstrative, and is feverish to have itself advertised. Meantime private life, while enlarging its sphere and multiplying its blessings, conceals itself from prying inspection. Christianity, thanks to God, does not imitate the daily newspaper. It follows the method of the family, and not that of the babbling thoroughfare. Its emblem is the dew falling in quiet benedictions. It "cometh not with observation." If so, how can we apply the measure of the sense-intellect to its workings, and take a census of its products as we

would of the population and its wealth? Its statistics are not within our reach, and never can be. Christian institutions endowed, hospitals erected, asylums opened, charities increased, sermons preached, Sunday-schools established, five millions of the colored people cared for, the amazing impulse recently given to the spirit of foreign missions, hundreds of thousands converted annually to God—these are, indeed, magnificent results, and they are occurring right under our eyes. But, notwithstanding all these things, we have here but a fragment of the glorious effects of Christianity in our century. The grandeur of Christianity is, that it can dispense with the attestations of the senses and the sensuous intellect. It is the leaven of almightiness, and, therefore, hidden. Only in one sphere is its sublimity fully exercised—the sphere of unconsciousness; and while the earth alternates its affluence of fertility and loveliness in successive seasons, and the stars move in visible splendor night by night across the vast spaces of the firmament, Christianity is content to exert its unceasing omnipotence where no eye can see and no voice can celebrate the majesty of its triumphs. And so evermore the miracle of Christ, with the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, repeats itself. Our eyes are "holden," and the Infinite Glory walks by our side in the garb of a stranger.

Art. V.—THE EARLY ERRORS AND RECENT PROGRESS OF PHILOLOGY.

The days of the Old Philology are numbered. Born almost too late to witness the death of its sisters, the other deductive sciences, and sole relic of their brood, it has passed through a green old age and lingering dissolution which are among the marvels of the century. Now that in the department of the classics we see at last all the old manuals which taught us in our school-boyhood that Greek was parent to the Latin either discarded, or rewritten in order to embody "the latest results of modern scholarship," we may safely pronounce the dominion of mediæval ideas in philology over, and the succession of true linguistic science accomplished. The occasion suggests the following inquiries: What were the errors of the dis-

carded philology, and the reason of its strange persistence? What is the science of Comparative Philology, and how did it originate? These questions we shall endeavor to answer briefly.

It is a difficult task to revive the assumptions which formed the basis of an ancient science; but it is not hard to account for the rise of philology. It has, in fact, had many beginnings; and under the old conditions, or out of the reach of the new light, would create itself independently again in many an isolated brain. It did not grow up, like the other sciences, from accumulated traditions, nor was it propagated in a lineage of masters, but rather may be said to have perpetuated itself from its own ashes. All the outfit that was necessary for a discoverer in philology was a mind consenting to be curious about the origin of words and speech. No special preparation was called for, no mastery of predecessors' labors: all the requisite material was derivable from within. For the tendency to etymologize,—to push words back upon their reserves of meaning, is common to the learned and illiterate alike, and amounts to an instinct of the race. It seems to be accepted as an axiom by every mind that words contain within themselves some warrant for their existence, and, like coin, possess an intrinsic value in addition to that stamped upon their face. The man wholly unlettered, and slow to appropriate the language of books, displays this tendency in his so-called popular etymologies. When he hears long and unusual words that convey to his mind no meaning, he instinctively forces them into some shape self-explaining or at least intelligible, and capable of being remembered and put to use. To his ear asparagus is "sparrow-grass" or nothing, and perhaps equinoctial, "*auctioncer*."* The man of literary tastes and culture, though in general content to accept the facts of his native language without inquiry, who perhaps never looks into his dictionary for a derivation, will yet, upon occasion, philosophize over the origin and inner meaning of some word which has impressed his fancy, and will probably experience a lively curiosity concerning the many correspondences he discovers in the languages he may chance to know. If his tastes are decidedly linguistic, or if he be drawn into the field of lexicography or some other

* A veritable instance, heard repeatedly by the writer from the lips of an illiterate native of New England.

specially philological labor, he will in time frame a theory of his own concerning the relations of the languages with which he has to do,—a theory which experience shows is likely to be different from all others ever devised, yet with them will surely be reducible to this assumption: that any given word in any language can be explained by some other word similar in meaning, form, or both, in some other language, living or dead. That the languages thus associated should be, or ever have been, spoken by contiguous peoples, or should have ever had the opportunity of mutual borrowing, is not thought of at all as a condition, the essential unity of all human speech being taken for granted with the rest. This common assumption—whether grounded on theological inferences, or an intuitional glimpse of truth, crude as the mediæval belief in the philosopher's stone, it would be useless to inquire here—is the sole basis of the philology now discarded.

The old scholars seem never to have encountered the suspicion that their principle was too broad. If they found a word in Chinese or Zulu similiar in sound or meaning to an English or German vocable, they did hesitate to affirm that the two terms were identical, or that one was parent to the other. How it was possible for races utterly unlike in civilization, and separated for thousands of years from all possible contact, to borrow words from one another, they did not stop to inquire. They did not stop to think, moreover, that in many instances the older forms of the words compared were very unlike their present shape. There are even yet eminent investigators of the outlying languages of the world who refuse to be warned of the risk of inaccuracy here. If they find a word in an African or South American language, which, as often enough happens, has the same pronunciation as some word in English, and a meaning not irreconcilably diverse, they accept it at once as a case of identity, without taking the precaution of inquiring whether either or both of the words have changed in form since the earliest known records of the languages. We recollect how loath we were to give up the belief that *whole* was the Greek ὅλος: we had found this asserted in our earliest Greek vocabulary, and it was a most convincing etymology. But the primitive or earliest known Teutonic form of *whole* is *hails*, between which and ὅλος no such affinity would have been suspected.

There was, moreover, an almost utter ignorance in those early days of the laws of change and growth in language, which are as positive and unfailing as any thing in science. Thus it has been established that two kindred dialects, if entirely separated and without the conservative force of a literature and literary standards, can in a century become so dissimilar as to conceal all proof of kinship except to trained and expert examination. In the case of two languages thus dissevered and grown unlike, identity of form or meaning must be held as casual, and no relationship admitted until by tracing to first stages the original of each word is seen to have been identical in archaic form. In general, in etymology, mere resemblance must go for nothing, since the most direct and positive kinship will often be found to exist in words every way unlike. Nothing is to be admitted in derivation except on proof, which proof must consist in tracing words back through their history to their first occurrence or their source. If, for example, we wish to find the origin of the English plural *are*, which does not occur in Anglo-Saxon, instead of resorting to the Latin and fastening its parentage upon *eram*, which would not be worse than many of the hap-hazard etymologies, we should begin with to-day's English and follow the word back through old authors to its first appearance in the language. It will in this way be quickly proved of alien origin, represented in its oldest form by the Old Norse *erum*, and brought into English by the Danes. This recourse to the earliest monuments of a language, and the calling into service of its history to determine the derivation of its words, have given the name Historical Etymology to that branch of modern philology.

A moderate number of coincidences of form or meaning, moreover, was accepted as proof that the languages in which they occurred were similar or akin. But close comparison of all most any two languages, taken at random, will disclose enough accidental resemblances to afford such evidence; and the philologists were speedily confounded in a new confusion. There was no starting-point from which to begin the classification of the languages of the world; and without determining the families of human speech there was little hope of progress. For more than two centuries the maze grew wider with every newly acquired language, until in the discovery of Sanskrit the

key to the required classification was obtained, and the science of comparative philology established. It is a curious history, and will be given as nearly as may be from the beginning in the order of events.

Philology, though named by the Greeks, does not date its proper beginning from their era. They had too much contempt for the babblers (*βάρβαροι*) who constituted the rest of mankind, to compare speech with them; and Rome later, bent only on universal conquest and domination, cared little for the languages she displaced with Latin. The first philologists, therefore, do not appear until after the revival of learning. Essays at verbal etymology are here and there met with in Plato, Cicero, Varro, and the scholiasts, but hardly a glance at the broad field destined at length to be occupied by western scholars. To Theodore Bibliander appears to belong the credit of beginning the comparison of miscellaneous tongues. He published in 1548 a commentary containing a version of the Lord's Prayer in fourteen languages, and a theory of affinity in which he derives the Celtic dialects from Greek. This labor was quickly imitated and its comparisons extended by other scholars, so that by the end of the century the Lord's Prayer had been published in fifty different tongues. As the survey of the linguistic field advanced fresh correspondences were noted, and new explanations of the affinities they were supposed to prove attempted. Lipsius and others asserted a close relationship between the Persian and German languages, which was explained by the supposition that the former idiom had been produced by the blending of Greek, Latin, and German elements. But ere long the attention of philologists was drawn away from the task of linking together the various languages of the world to the negative one of explaining how they could all have been derived from Hebrew. The belief that this must have been the original speech of man had been found in the writings of the Fathers, who had derived it perhaps traditionally from Jewish sources, and was held by nearly all scholars of note. A small minority in the mean time put forth counter theories of the most diverse, and often of the most amusing, character. Goropius Becanus maintained that Dutch must have been the dialect of Eden, and, in a work published in 15[illegible], attempted to show that the very names Adam and Eve were

self-evident compounds of Low-Dutch words. Other claimants of the honor were Pezron for the Celtic, Kempe for the Scandinavian dialects, and the Spaniard Erro for the Basque. But the orthodox had better grounds for their advocacy of Hebrew. It being admitted, as it then was universally, that speech was not a human instrument, but a divine gift to man, it was natural to conclude that it must have been imparted in the form of a complete and perfected language. What language could this have been if not the Hebrew, the language of the chosen race and the depositary of the oracles of God? In this reasoning they seem to have forgotten the Confusion, which, whatever the original speech, would have changed it beyond recognition. At any rate, the task of tracing the multitude of tongues so diverse to this Semitic source proved not only discouraging but endless. Every new language complicated the problem. Not even could the venerated Greek and Latin, the next languages in importance, be successfully referred to this original: the great skill and acumen with which one authority professed to have proved the descent were rejected by another no less eminent. At length, after several generations of zealous toil had been thrown away in the vain attempt to solve this false enigma, the time arrived for putting away the deductive method also from philology. The inductive system had already yielded rich results in other fields. It was the days of Newton and Leibnitz; and the latter philosopher, after compassing the whole circle of science, paused to inaugurate anew the department of philology. In a letter to Tenzel he called attention to the utter absence of proof that Hebrew was any thing more than any other language. He urged upon travelers the necessity of gathering the facts and vocabularies of all new languages they should chance to find, not only for the sake of philological material, but also as aid in solving the problems of ethnography, another scientific departure of this master-mind. In a letter written in 1713 to Peter the Great, he suggests the systematic collation of vocabularies and translations of the Lord's Prayer and Ten Commandments into the various obscure idioms of the empire. "This," he adds, "would increase the glory of your majesty, . . . and likewise, by means of a comparison of languages, enable us to discover the origin of those nations which have advanced from Scythia to other countries."

Leibnitz had inferred, from the small array of facts at hand, that the nations of Europe had emigrated from the East. He did not live to see his wishes accomplished. None of his supporters had his foresight or expectations, though the impulse he gave to research and comparison of dialects did not die out. Some time after his death his plan of collating languages was taken up by the Spanish Jesuit missionary Don Lorenzo Hervas, who, after many years of unremitting labor, published a catalogue of more than three hundred languages. This was in 1800. A few years before he had seen the first grammar of Sanskrit, the work of Fra Paolo di San Bartolomeo, just published at Rome, and was thus put in possession of some facts unaccessible before. Although with the key to the enigma of the western languages thus in his hands, Hervas failed to recognize its use, finding in the new language proofs merely that the Greeks had borrowed forms of speech from the farthest Orient. Meanwhile other laborers scarcely less diligent were executing the behests of Leibnitz. The advice contained in his letter to Peter the Great had lain neglected during the czar's lifetime, but now found acceptance with the Empress Catharine II. She not only favored the plan Leibnitz had sketched out, but entered also personally into the drudgery of its execution, and appears to have withdrawn from all business of state for the best part of a year, comparing languages and filling up tables of correspondences from all the languages of which she could obtain information. At length tiring of the labor, she consigned her mass of materials to Prof. Pallas, the naturalist, to be finished for publication. It was an ungrateful commission, hastily and perfunctorily executed (*invita Minerva*, as he confesses), the work appearing in 1787. It bore a rather pretentious title, *Linguarum Totius Orbis Vocabularia Comparativa*, considering that in the first edition only the Asiatic and European languages were compared. A few years later there were added several of the African and American dialects, amounting to two hundred and eighty in all. A still greater work,—the final of its class, and derived largely from the two preceding, was now projected, the *Mithridates* of Adelung and Vater. It filled four volumes, and was not finished until 1817. In plan it was essentially different from its predecessors, containing, instead of alphabetic

word-lists, a history and description of the various languages, with tables of correspondences and versions of the Lord's Prayer.

But, since 1784, the most important work was being done for philology in India. The task of reducing important languages elsewhere to grammar and comparison had long been prosecuted, but only the most barren and unsatisfactory results had been derived. The reason lay in the strange omission of Sanskrit from the close examination that had generally been given to other tongues,—Sanskrit, the only language capable of throwing light upon the others. In the year just named the Asiatic Society was founded at Calcutta, and the sacred idiom of the Brahmins began to yield its secrets. Sir William Jones was the first member of this famous coterie to perceive and declare its relations to the classic languages. A very slight examination was sufficient to reveal to him what had escaped Bartolomeo and the two or three priests who had studied the language before him, that this Sanskrit, with the Greek and Latin, had sprung from some common parent apparently no longer in existence: they were sister languages, dialects of the same family, and not derived from one another. It was scarcely less probable, he further observed, that the Celtic, Zend, and Gothic were descended from the same source. In point of literary merit he rated the Sanskrit as far superior to Greek and Latin, an opinion which later study shows was unduly influenced by the almost unrivaled sweetness and beauty of a single work, the Shakuntăla of Kalidāsa. This drama he translated into English, together with the episode of Nala, from the mammoth epic called the Mahā-bhārata, while other members of the society prepared translations of other Sanskrit classics, and compiled grammars from the voluminous works of native scholars upon that subject.

The necessity for the use of Sanskrit in the Indian civil service soon brought manuscripts and teachers to England to set up the study of the language there. After the death of Sir William Jones, in 1794, there was left no scholar in England apparently at all inclined to examine further into the kind or degree of resemblance borne by Sanskrit to its sister dialects. The part England was to perform for comparative philology seems to have been only to give the less venturesome nations

of Europe access to Sanskrit stores. Scholars from the continent were at once attracted to London to study the new language and make copies of its manuscripts, and among them two Germans, whose names are imperishably connected with the science of language they were to found,—Frederick Schlegel and Francis Bopp. Schlegel was the first to be heard from on his return, and in his "Essay upon the Language and Philosophy of the Indians" drew the almost obvious inferences which form the basis of modern philology, and formulated some of its governing principles. To the family of languages thus established he applied the name Indo-Germanic, derived from what he supposed were the antipodal limits of its spread. All this was but the work of the discoverer and pioneer. Bopp followed in 1816 with his "System of Conjugation," in which he compared the inflection of the verb in the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Persian, and German languages. In this, though a most important work, Bopp but lays the foundation of the greatest name in philology. He afterward superseded it by his Comparative Grammar of the Greek, Latin, Zend, Lithuanic, Slavonic, Gothic, and German languages, which, in consideration of the fact that he had no predecessors from whom to draw, fairly eclipses all the discoveries and achievements made by other investigators in philology, and goes far toward establishing his fame as inferior to none other among all scientists. So firm is Bopp's hold upon every side of his vast subject, and so clear and sagacious his perception, that only in minute particulars is his work defective, and can never be superseded. The first volume, which appeared in 1833, was the fruit of twenty years' labor, and twenty years more were required to finish the whole work.

The attention of linguists, as we have seen, was early drawn to the close resemblances of form in many words observed in certain of the languages above enumerated. It is no wonder that their minds were filled with expectation: such correspondences could have sprung only from some remarkable fact of connection; and this conviction spurred them to persevere in their gropings after its discovery. In the majority of cases where there was similarity of form there was also identity of meaning, as in these examples:

English,	*brother*	*new*	*month*	*name*	*strew*
Sanskrit,	bhratar	nava	mas	naman	stri
Persian,	brata	nava	maonh	naman	star
Greek,	*φρατήρ*	*νέος*	*μήν*	*ὀ-νομα*	*στρώννυμι*
Latin,	frater	novus	mensis	nomen	sterno
Gothic,	brothar	niuyis	mena	namo	straujan
German,	brude	neu	monat	name	streuen
Slavonic,	bratr	novu	meseci	i-man	stre

Such instances of almost perfect identity of form and meaning in languages, separated by thousands of miles of space and thousands of years of time from the possibility of mutual borrowing, might be said to constitute in themselves sufficient evidence of kinship. But the many accidental coincidences which are constantly met with, in meaning as well as form, in words belonging to the most unrelated languages, require that the investigator find a likeness of grammatical structure also before admitting relationship or descent. Schlegel laid down this first principle of comparative philology, and demonstrated that in the comparison of languages really akin this evidence will never be wanting, and can never mislead; since, however much languages may borrow from one another's vocabularies, they can never borrow methods of inflection. Bopp illustrated this truth in his "Conjugationssystem" by comparisons of inflectional terminations like the following, in which the similarity is seen to be hardly less striking than before:

	SINGULAR.			PLURAL.			
English,	*bear-*	*bear-est*	*bear-eth*	English,	*bear-*	*bear-*	*bear-*
Sanskrit,	bharā-mi	bhara-si	bhara-ti	Sanskrit,	bharā-mas	bhara-tha	bhara-nti
Persian,	barā-mi	bara-hi	bara-ti	Persian,	barā-mahi	bara-ta	bara-nti
Greek,	*φέρω-*	*(φέρε-σι)*	*(φέρε-τι)*	Greek,	*(φέρο-μες)*	*φέρε-τε*	*(φέρο-ντι)*
Latin,	fero-	(feri-s)	(feri-t)	Latin,	feri-mus	(feri-tis)	feru-nt
Gothic,	bai-ra	bairi-s	bairi-th	Gothic,	baira-m	bairi-th	baira-nd
O. German,	beru-	beri-s	beri-t	O. German,	bera-mes	bera-t	bera-nt
Celtic,	biur-	bir-	beri-d	Celtic,	bera-m	beri-th	bera-t
Slavonic,	bra-mi	bra-shi	bra-ti	Slavonic,	bra-mu	bru-te	bra-nti

Such correspondences as these were found to run through the whole system of inflection, noun as well as verb; and nearer examination revealed every-where still more minute traces of original identity. Bopp continued his investigations with indefatigable zeal, and soon, re-enforced by the labors of other eminent philologists, proceeded to solve some of the most abstruse problems of the science. This half century be-

ginning with the date of Schlegel's "Essay" is the heroic age of philology. Almost every department was at once occupied, and with a genius and enthusiasm which we are already beginning to wonder at. One of the early questions which had arisen—that relative to the common origin of the verb-endings above given—was answered in a discovery which, in a sense, was the key to the whole Indo-Germanic system of inflection. These endings were found to be nothing less than the personal pronouns, which, as subject to the verb, had been placed after instead of before it, and at length compounded with it. A mere glance at the table shows this true for the singular. In the plural the pronouns were combined, *ma-sa* (*me* and *thou*) forming the needed *we*, *sa-ta* (*thou* and *he*) the second personal suffix, and *an-ti* (*he* and *he*, or *that one* and *that*) the third. Thus was here obtained a glimpse of the root-stage of the primitive Indo-Germanic speech, and of the beginning of its inflection. Words which stood in isolation and independent in the sentence, as in Chinese, had become compounds; then, through long use, the independent significance and value of one of them being lost sight of, it was degraded to a mere affix, and became an instrument of inflection. Every-where in the system of substantive declension Bopp found the fossil relics of extinct words; and, further, in the verb the signs of voice, tense, and mode were traced to words still preserved in Sanskrit or Greek. Finally, evidence was accumulated sufficient to require the conclusion that every syllable of all polysyllables in any of the languages of the family (including each descendant, and hence modern English also) is the representative of what was originally an independent word. From the monosyllabic stage to the full inflectional, composition had been the principle of growth. As for the time required for this development there were no safe grounds for computation; but the study of the languages of other families of human speech had furnished illustrations of the process. The Chinese was an instance of a language which had remained monosyllabic and isolating from its earliest history; but in the body of this speech there were found traces of the beginning of composition which had probably been checked at the outset, but would yet, perhaps, overcome the rigid traditions of the language in its own good time. In the Turkish and Japanese there was found an example of growth

by composition, checked at the point where each element used in inflection retained its early, independent meaning. This may be seen in the inflection of the Turkish verb, to love. The first person, *sever-im*, is not I love, but lover-I; *sever-sen* is lover-thou; while the third person is simply *sever*, lover. Thus in like manner for the plural, *sever-iz*, *sever-siz*, *sever-ler*. Here we see that the pronouns *im*, *sen*, *iz*, etc., are not mere suffixes or endings of inflection, but keep their value as in true compounds. In these languages there is proof that the further progress of inflection had been begun: there are forms in which the added syllables are little more than endings, containing no longer the independent suggestion of things, but only of relation. There is little doubt that this development would have gone on rapidly had not national success introduced the practice of writing and insured the foundation of a literature. All languages stop rapid changes, except of vocabulary, at the civilized stage, though each family has its own type and own limit of development. The Indo-Germanic languages show also that a type when once perfected may return upon its steps toward cruder forms, as is so often illustrated in geology. After the primitive or parent speech had perfected the wonderful system of inflection which Sanskrit so well preserves, it began to retrace the path of centuries. Each successive descendant dialect shows increased inflectional loss, until we have in the unborrowed or Anglo-Saxon half of modern English a virtual return to monosyllabism.

The old conjecture of a period when only the ultimate roots of speech were used was thus confirmed; and even these roots were in due time traced out and reduced to two ultimate classes, a pronominal and a verbal, the former including those roots used at will in the designation of objects, the latter names of attributes. It was little further that science could go in this direction, and the question of the origin of language and of the kind and degree of relationship borne by the different families of language to one another, was put off for a time. Meanwhile inquiries relative to the earlier history of the Indo-Germanic, or now preferably called Indo-European, dialects, were being prosecuted. Of these the Sanskrit was clearly the oldest, having preserved the system of inflection of the primitive language, whatever that was, almost unaltered. A glance,

such as we have taken above, in the way of comparison, was enough to show how widely each of the other languages had departed from the norm. In the eight cases of Sanskrit, which included a locative and an instrumental, one reads the cause of the double and triple functions of certain cases in Greek and Latin, and of the consequent confusion in their syntax. Sanskrit had preserved these ancient forms because it had ceased to be a living speech so early, passing out of use about 500 B. C., and from the accident of being a sacred language, and so guarded against change. Its inner sanctity proceeded from the circumstance of its being the depositary of the Brahmanic Scriptures, the four Vedas, which were compositions that had been handed down traditionally from a period long anterior to written speech. So sacredly had these treasures been preserved that the words and metric form had often been kept when the traditional interpretation had been lost. This was of inestimable importance, as the knowledge obtained by applying the aid of comparative philology could be accepted as undeniably authentic. The results obtained were surprising. Hardly a dogma or a practice of the modern religion of the Brahmins was found sanctioned or recorded in these old rituals, while in character and customs the patriarchal forefathers were shown to have been incomparably superior to their effeminate descendants. Many local references prove that this ancient people were newcomers into India, and were advancing from the north-west passes to the occupancy of the country. The period of this immigration could have been but little later than 2000 B. C.

Burnouf, in his researches with the Zend, found out the late companions of this wandering people. It had fallen to his lot to attempt the riddle of the Parsis. This people, Persian exiles in India since probably the tenth century, had been discovered to be worshipers of fire according to what purported to be the ritual of the Zoroastrian religion, and to possess sacred books written in a language they no longer understood. From these a translation that had long before been made into their more modern speech was in use among the priests. Manuscripts of these scriptures—the Zend-Avesta—were brought to Europe, but no scholar could decipher their forgotten secrets. In 1771 Anquetil Duperon published a full translation, but from the version of the Parsis, and not from the originals. Fifty years

later Erasmus Rask, the eminent Danish scholar, established the fact that there was an intimate connection between the Avestan language and the Sanskrit; but it was reserved for the above-named French *savant*, Eugène Burnouf, to employ the Sanskrit more fully as the key. By applying certain discovered laws of phonetic equivalence, he speedily reduced the Avestan vocabulary to its Sanskrit counterpart, and read the original with ease. From the near resemblance of the languages there could be no question of the recent union of the Zoroastrian community and the people of the Vedas. Also the geographic references contained in the Avesta were unmistakably to Bactria as the place of its composition, a region significantly near to the path of Vedic emigration. The period of separation had been sufficient, but only through the rise of a great religious leader, to develop striking changes in the religion of the Persians. All other evidence, and especially that of the still near identity of language, showed unmistakably that hardly more than five centuries could have elapsed since the two peoples had swarmed apart from one another. For this was clearly the manner of their separation. The one people, grown so numerous as to cumber the soil, (the Vedic records show that still the principal wealth was cattle,) must needs disperse, and after filling a wider neighborhood for a time, wander in clans or sections out of mutual reach and knowledge. Thus, probably long before, the Greek and Latin tribes had become successively detached and wandered westward through Asia Minor, while still earlier, and from a position more interior and northward, the Celtic and Teutonic emigrations had moved forth. Here then was the explanation of the origin of dialects. There was no parent speech which had sent off portions of itself west and south, itself remaining to perish in old age upon the central plains of Asia. Rather, each migrating portion of the family bore away the same original speech, but, in isolation and under the influence of different circumstances, each changed it in a different way, until the long dissevered communities were as unlike in language as in national types and dress. The long array of evidence and argument by which it was proved that this change need not have been, and undoubtedly was not, greater than is now daily taking place in language, especially if unwritten, and that it was of the same character as each of us

is helping to make continually in his own vernacular by his discourse and writing, cannot be epitomized and must be excluded here. But it will be an aid to the understanding of the long process if we examine some of the changes undergone by these languages within the range of history. Sanskrit has given rise to three idioms, the Bengali, Hindi, and Mahratta, but by no other than a quiet and unconscious transformation. Instead of the ponderous and highly inflected Sanskrit which was spoken by the high-born and priestly caste, the lower classes and the women used a simpler dialect, the Prakrit, a kind of patois; and in time the latter prevailed as being the easier to speak, leaving the Sanskrit to the grammarians and the learned. This patois-Prakrit, with the Pali, which was a like simplified derivative of Sanskrit, can be followed through long centuries of development until we arrive at the modern period of the dialects just named. Latin, as we more familiarly know, has perished in a similar way, less cultivated and bookish idioms having sprung up beside it, which finally displaced it from sheer preponderance of usage. The Greek, on the contrary, has never ceased to be a living speech, though it has so far abandoned its ancient type that Homer and his coworthies have had to be translated. But the best example of simple and undirected growth in language is afforded by the German, which, in addition to having been only in the slightest degree acted upon and altered by external influences, possesses an inner conservatism and inflexibility which have tended to minify the expected progress. Here we are also fortunate in having for comparison the fragments of Ulfilas' Gothic version of the Scriptures, made in the fourth century. The Mœso-Goths, whose language may be safely taken as representative of the speech of our Germanic forefathers of that day, had just settled upon the Danube under the protection of the empire. The following, from Matt. v, 38, of Ulfilas' version, would puzzle the profoundest German scholar, if unaided, to decipher: *Hausideduth thatei qithan ist, augo und augin, jah tanthu und tunthau.* "Ye (have) heard that it is said, Eye for eye, and tooth for tooth." In the transition there has been no violence, no conquest and engrafting of a foreign idiom, as in English; only a little more than a thousand years of natural, unconscious development or growth.

In the labors of etymology, which had now begun to be prosecuted according to the historical method spoken of above, it was observed that the liquids were generally found unaltered all the way from German back to Greek and Sanskrit, while the mutes had, for the most part, suffered changes. Upon closer examination these changes seemed to be restricted, each mute being shifted to a different order merely, never to a different class. Something of the kind had been observed before by Rask, the Dane, but had never been made to yield a principle. The principle was at length detected by Jacob Grimm, the great Teutonic philologist and lexicographer, and formulated into what will probably always be called from its discoverer "Grimm's Law." It simply declares the scale of change: a surd or smooth mute in Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin will appear in the Low German dialects (including English) as an aspirate of the same class, and in High German as a sonant or middle mute; an aspirate in the same primitive languages will be in Low German a sonant, in High German a surd; and, finally, a primitive sonant will yield for Low German a surd, and for High German an aspirate mute. To illustrate, *κέρας* and *cornu* ought to show their *κ* and *c* in English in the form of *h*, as is the fact in *horn*. So the Latin *homo* is traced to the English *g(r)oom* (Anglo-Saxon *guma*, man); and *genus* will be *kin*. Or, to illustrate throughout the scale:

Sanskrit.	Greek.	Latin.	Gothic.	English.	Old High German.
trayas	*τρεῖς*	*tres*	*threis*	*three*	*dri*
danta	*ὁ-δοντ-*	*dent-*	*tunthus*	*tooth*	*zand*
bhar	*φέρειν*	*ferre*	*bairan*	*bear*	*peran*

The words given above in the table on page 679, and especially the verb-endings in the table following, can also be brought into much nearer conformity by this rule.

The further studies of Bopp and the brothers Grimm in the Teutonic field were exceedingly fruitful. Among the many results established the brief compass of our sketch will allow the admission of only one. In the Gothic there was found a small group of verbs which still preserved a genuine reduplication, the same in significance and form as that of the Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin. The remainder of the so-called irregular verbs showed the vowel change which the Germanic languages still preserve, such as is seen in *sing, sang, sung*. Certain feat-

ures in this vowel change were peculiar, and led finally to the remarkable discovery that these verbs also were once reduplicated, and owed their change of vowel to contraction. This may be illustrated from the Anglo-Saxon, in which the former class of verbs in Gothic appear with vowel changes, namely: Gothic, *haldan*, hold, imperfect, *hai-hald*, I held; Anglo-Saxon, *healdan*, imperfect, *heóld*. Thus the so-called irregular verbs of English and German were proved to be the oldest and most normal in inflection. The "regular" verbs were found to be the result of composition—the inevitable resort of the Indo-European languages to supply loss and extend inflection with the preterit *did*, of the verb to *do*. If we return to the sentence above quoted from the Gothic, "*Hausideduth thatei*," etc., we shall see an example of this union. *Hausi-ded-uth* is demonstrably *hear-did-ye*, the *uth* being the regular termination of the second plural of the Gothic preterit or imperfect. In English the whole has been shortened to *ed* or *d;* in German, as required by Grimm's principle, to *te*.

Grimm began at once to make practical use of these discoveries in his great *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, but, strange to say, it was found impossible to make them otherwise useful to the public. The eminent scholars who were busy brooding over the classical languages shook their heads, and declined the trouble of hearing about the new discoveries, or of putting them to the proof. The old theory of the descent of Latin from Greek continued to be put forth, with always sufficient variation to make it, at least to its propounders, new: and prodigies of industry were wrought by men like Döderlein in tracing and calculating *a priori* the minute steps of derivation. Passow and Freund prosecuted their patient labors unassisted by the new light; and their works, translated and re-issued in this country, retarded, as by an eclipse, the rising dawn of a true philology. Our own venerated lexicographer of English, Noah Webster, from the same lack of a key to the classification of speech which had led to the collective waste of centuries of toil before the days of Schlegel, spent twenty years in the useless study of miscellaneous languages, in the fond belief that the etymologies he needed could there be mined. Enthusiastic scholars of Greek and Latin refined upon the old dogmas in their zeal, and notably Prof. Crosby, who, in his earlier gram-

mar, devised a beautiful system of upbuilding for the Greek, which he loved too well to suppose was not a primitive language. But at length the facts and teachings of the new science began to be received by the new generation of scholars. Learned societies sprang up and disseminated its truths and principles. Germany had at last been dawned upon by the true light of linguistic science, and it could not be long before the new day of truth would reach also our western shores. In 1860 Prof. Hadley published his adaptation of the Greek Grammar of Georg Curtius, which had been prepared upon an adequate basis of comparative philology. This was an innovation, and stood alone for more than a decade. Then followed a similar manual for the Latin, and American scholarship generally began to be revised. Now we have attained such progress that, probably, never again will linguistic authorship succeed among us, unless provided with the warrant of historic truth.

The progress of philology since the death of Bopp and Grimm has continued without interruption, and can be summed up briefly. The fields of labor have been more carefully surveyed, and it is now agreed where the boundaries must pass. There are three great divisions of language recognized: the Indo-European (Japhetic), the Semitic, and the Scythian or Turanian. The latter is not a family in any strict sense, but serves as a kind of temporary category for all languages of indeterminate relationship and origin. Labor thus far has been but sparingly bestowed upon this field; the Semitic and Aryan prove still the most alluring. Great achievements have not only been wrought by Pott and others in the department first entered by Bopp, but also by special investigators who have passed somewhat beyond the pale of abstract linguistics. Facts bearing with great positiveness upon ethnology have been established, and the beginnings of history have been pushed backward. The great clearness with which, as cannot fail to have been observed, central Asia had been suggested as the starting-point of Indo-European emigration attracted early attention. It was found that there were distinct Scandinavian and, probably, Celtic traditions of such westward march; and the Slavs, the youngest member of the Indo-Germanic family, had forced their way into the society of European nations within the cog-

nizance of history. One branch of the latter people, the Lithuanic, had brought with them, and were still speaking, a language which had changed so little from its primitive Asiatic condition as to rival even the Sanskrit in ancientness of type. It retained the eight cases of the primitive language except the ablative, the dual number, with much of its phonetic system and many of its radicals. In the verb especially was it well preserved. This was phenomenal; the resemblance of the Zend to Sanskrit was hardly less striking. From the Indo-Persian or Aryan branch was gathered further assurance,—indeed, positive tradition from the Brahmins. Finally, no small contribution toward determining the home of the Indo-European nations was obtained by the sifting of their vocabularies; and not only the latitude of their first home, but a glimpse of the primitive Japhetic civilization and mode of life. The different vocabularies of all the Indo-European languages were carefully compared, and all words and terms not found in each, or which were not clearly brought away by each emigrating tribe in its earliest speech, were cast aside. The residue, of course, represented in some degree what might be called the dictionary of the primitive speech; and the words included constituted an index of the thought and a gauge of the intellectual advancement of the race who spoke it. This people were thus seen to have advanced somewhat beyond the purely nomadic stage, as they lived in towns which were often defended with walls and in stationary dwellings fitted with firm doors. They broke the soil with plows, and gathered harvests of wheat and barley. Wagons were in use, and boats propelled by oars. Cattle were still their chief riches, war and combat their pastime. The captives taken in battle were enslaved, but woman was regarded as man's equal, and treated with respect. It was not a hot country where thus they lived, for winter was dreaded and spring hailed with gladness. The forests grew of the hardy oak, and the constellation of the Ursa Major was most conspicuous and admired. As to the longitude of this fatherland, it could only be proved that it was remote from seas—no name for ocean can be found, the country abounded in streams, and was in sight of mountains. There were found traces also of a traditional first man, and of a flood causing universal destruction, from which man alone escaped. Hence it has been in-

ferred by some philologists that the Aryan and Semitic peoples were once united, and the problem was accepted of eventually proving the identity by comparison of languages. Thus far, however, the attempt has been entirely unsuccessful.

With respect to the origin of language, it is only recently that inquiries have begun to be conducted in a scientific way. Only lately, indeed, have enough phenomena of the life and growth of language been collected to make such investigation possible. The old belief that speech was of divine origin,—probably a direct impartation to human lips, was long accepted. William von Humboldt was the first to point out that the miracle was no greater thus than if man were found to have been so endowed as to devise and fabricate it for himself. It is certainly a human instrument, and, considering the instinct and necessity of communication, no more remarkable than many known achievements of mankind. The necessity for shelter has led him to devise implements with which to build, and these he has improved from the rudest types in stone to the most intricate and complicated steel machinery. Every art has made like progress, and from equally rude beginnings. Science shows that language could have begun in a like simple way, and in like manner perfected itself, thinking only of supplying the present need, and never aiming to improve itself, yet constantly improving. There seems no doubt that children growing up together and denied all knowledge of their mother-tongue would gradually devise a system of vocal communication. Every child does almost as much; in his early essays at speech he invents names of his own for surrounding objects, which, being accepted at his value by others, become actual elements of language. If he could only find associates willing to continue their use with him, they would serve a lifetime as well as any terms of speech. For the old notion that it makes any difference to a child learning to talk what kind of language he hears, whether correct speech or patois, or that he would speak at all (much less the primitive language), if he were sequestered from all communication by spoken signs, was among the first to give way before actual investigation. The missionary's child learns the idiom of his adopted country as readily as the language of his parents, and with greater rapidity and ease if he chance to hear less of their conversation than of his

native nurse's. He will, however, try his hand at amending and extending both, until warned by the limits of intelligibility. He finds that, to communicate his ideas successfully, he must use terms familiar to other people. There must be convention in regard to the meaning and value of words and phrases; he must add his consent to the collective consent of the community that such and such a term shall have such and such significance. It is, in fact, this consent which makes language what it is; remove the convention, and it becomes a useless instrument. Each member of the commonwealth of speech not only consents to the labors of his predecessors in making and altering language, but is himself continually passing personal judgment of disfavor or approval upon certain empirical changes, and upon the admission of the new terms required by the growth of ideas and knowledge. Some of these will be embodied into living language by the preponderance of consenting suffrages, some will perish still-born upon the threshold of existence. Many curious illustrations might be cited, if space permitted, of the failure of well-devised terms, and of the success of others obviously inapt, through some freak of the popular fancy. This voice of the people may be folly, or it may be wisdom, but it is final. Each intelligent speaker is therefore not only a censor over the common speech: in his indorsement of the old and his judgment of the new, his activity is the same, if not in degree at least in kind, as that of an originator or adapter. And it must not be forgotten that the process of mastering one's vernacular, a thing never perfectly accomplished, and the acquiring of that habit of correct and dignified speech called style, require the constant labor of half a lifetime. The invention of the humble beginnings of speech which philology supposes, could not have been a more difficult process than is the mastery of the finished product, any more than the crude beginnings of the mechanic's art were more abstruse and difficult than the mastery of the accumulated and complex appliances of the modern artisan.

But how can speech have been begun without materials? How was it possible for those whose task it was to originate language, to construct roots from nothing? Philology recognizes the difficulty of these questions, which it does not profess itself, as yet, able to answer, but suggests a theory which

cient to support its grounds—all the grounds it takes. For it does not deny the supernatural genesis of language, but, in the absence of evidence either way, only asserts the possibility of the human; and the latter view seems to commend itself to the thinking mind as the most reasonable and natural, the most in accord with the divine economy. The theory regarding the origin of the ultimate roots of language is that they could have been formed, at least in large measure, by imitation of natural sounds,—a process still in operation in all languages. Every child names objects independently in this way: his dog is "bow," an engine "puff-puff," and so on. The number of like onomatopoetic roots, such as buzz, hum, bang, whiz, whir, etc., which we constantly use and with perfect acceptance, suggests that we might multiply them indefinitely if our vocabulary should need replenishing. We should in that case make abundant use of analogy, both to bring objects and actions inaudible into relations with sound, as well as to extend roots directly imitative of sound-action into other meanings. Moreover, there is evidence to show that roots expressive of emotion can have arisen in their earliest form as interjections. These two processes, without being imagined to yield their utmost, can have furnished as many roots as are supposed to have been original in the primitive Indo-European language,—a number not exceeding a few hundred. It is, however, probable enough that the number of really original Indo-European roots was considerably less, and was gradually increased during the whole period of the growth of inflection, in the same manner as we know has been the case since until the present time.

But, though there is no little variance of opinion, we believe that philologists generally do not suppose a special root-creation for the Indo-European family. It is accepted as likely to be in time established that the ultimate roots of human speech were identical. We have already spoken of the attempts to bring the Indo-European and Semitic languages together; but the most careful examination has as yet brought to light hardly any thing more than may be found in the comparison of any two languages not known to be related,—resemblances which the unprejudiced philologer must consider accidental. To establish affinity between two languages or groups of languages there must be found traces of at least ultimate likeness in

structure; if such occur, on the principle that the greater includes the less, single words may then be admitted to comparison. Only the most wholesale conformity in vocabulary can be allowed as having the least weight, if no structural resemblances are discovered. Such likeness to the Japhetic structural type, as is well known, is nearly wanting in the Semitic tongues. The fact of triliterality of verb-roots and inflection by vowel-insertion is as far removed as possible from any thing Indo-European. In the matter of word-comparison there are on the whole, perhaps, rather fewer coincidences than are usually met with outside of family boundaries. Furthermore, the Semitic languages are exceptionally steadfast and intolerant of change. There is the strongest reason for believing that their rigid and inflexible type resisted the common tendencies of growth as successfully before the historical period as we can see it has done since. This, as all agree, will carry present differences back almost to the infancy of the race. Philologists can only resort to the supposition that ages separate the era when the Japhetic and Semitic communities parted and the stage at which each language assumed its earliest historic type. But the interval between Sanskrit and English —more than four thousand years, and a period of immense growth and change—has not been sufficient to obliterate the evidences of Indo-European kinship; while the task of connecting the ultimate roots of the two families meets with not the slightest encouragement or success. Surely there is in this the broad suggestion of some interference from without. Philologists, however, as true disciples of science, will have nothing to do with the Confusion. This is the first and only real conflict of comparative philology and Revelation; a conflict fortunately confined, for the most part, to the mute scorn on the one hand of the scientists, and the mute record on the other. Let us hope that no voice will break the silence until time vindicates the truth. For it is not improbable that proof may eventually be discovered, if not of the once complete union of the radical elements of Japhetic and Semitic speech, at least of the arbitrary and violent partition of the outermost of these radicals. Meanwhile one cannot but be reminded that geology readily admits the theory of cataclysms and glaciers to account for otherwise inexplicable phenomena; and one day

will science, when the meaning of "Nature" shall have been better comprehended, recognize the Confusion as no greater miracle.

We incline, therefore, to the view that philology will never approach much nearer to the beginnings of human speech. From the unclassified and miscellaneous languages of the world but small contribution can be expected toward the solution of this problem; for there is ample evidence that they have generally been subject to far greater changes than the Semitic and Indo-European. They have been longer in the process, many having still no written literature; and as for the languages of barbarous nations, they are observed sometimes to change beyond recognition in a century or two. But the future of comparative philology in other departments is full of promise. Phonetics, almost a science in itself, has advanced nearly to perfection in the present generation. The various vocal sounds capable of use in speech have been named and classified, and their correct formation and exact relations determined. With this apparatus the pronunciation of dead languages may be restored, and those newly discovered are reduced at once to writing. By its use, with the aid of comparison, the original alphabet of the primitive Indo-European pronunciation has been recovered, and the creation of later sounds explained. Like success may be predicted with the Scythian languages, when once they shall have received the requisite attention. It is probable, also, that most of these idioms retain enough of their primitive characteristics to be classified; and from this will doubtless emanate new light regarding the unity of the race and the early history of its wanderings. But for a long time yet will the chief philological interest cling to the Japhetic and Semitic families. The numberless Phœnician, Assyrian, and Sabean inscriptions have important secrets to reveal, and the problems of mythology are multiplying. Finally, there looms up the possibility of tracing the decadence of primitive monotheism and the beginnings of idolatry—a transition which, from the testimony of the Vedas, can have begun scarcely earlier than the Indo-European dispersion.

Art. VI.—THE ELEMENTS OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The Lord's Supper has supplanted the Feast of the Passover in the Jewish economy. If the Lord's Supper was part of the paschal feast that fact would have great force in determining what kind of bread was to be used in its celebration, and would decide what kinds of wine were permissible. If the supper was part of a common meal preceding that of the passover, then the bread and wine were not prescribed, but were such as were in common use in Judea at the time. In order to understand the import of the Lord's Supper the passover would necessarily come under our inspection, but more especially so if part of that ritual is still to be observed. For this consult Clarke's or Whedon's Commentary.

It is stated in chap. x, Treatise Pesachim, § 1: ". . . A person shall not have less than four cups of wine, even if they be given to him from the fund devoted to the charitable support of the very poor." In § 1, chap. iii, of the Pesach. it is stated: "The law concerning the due observance of the passover will be transgressed by using the following articles, namely, Babylonian בִּיהָה, (a mixture of moldy bread with milk and salt, used to dip food in,) Median beer, (made of wheat or barley,) Edomite vinegar, (made by the fermentation of barley and wine,) Egyptian zeithum, (the name of a medicine of Egyptian origin, mentioned by Pliny under the name of zythum; according to the Talmud it was composed of equal parts of barley, salt, and wild saffron,) etc." If there had been any article of *wine* in common use which could not be properly used in the passover, it would have been mentioned in this catalogue. The absence of any injunction, therefore, gives us to understand that the wine in common use, under the general term יַיִן, *yayin*, was used indiscriminately, while the benediction was pronounced using the general terms פְּרִי חַגָּפֶן, *peri haggapen*, *the fruit of the vine*, in all cases, as in the Hebrew ritual of the present day. It is worthy of remark that the word תִּירוֹשׁ, *tirosh*, *is never used in these benedictions for "the fruit of the vine,"* but the words פְּרִי חַגָּפֶן, *peri haggapen*, have invariably been used from the earliest times. This is a parallel expression to that of the Greek γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, *gennematos tes ampelou*, *fruit of the*

vine, used by our Saviour, or perhaps the Syriac in the Peshito New Testament, *aldo dagpitho*, and the translation of the words "fruit of the vine," מִתְּנוּבַת הַגֶּפֶן, *mitnubath haggephen*, signifying properly the growth or product of the vine. The words יֵין מְגִפְתּוֹ, *yayin megitto*, were used frequently to signify *new wine*, as opposed to יֵין יָשָׁן, *yayin yashan*, as in the Talmud, "Rabbi Jose said, to what may he who learneth the law from little children be likened? To one who eateth sour grapes and drinketh *new wine;* but he who learneth from the old men may be compared to one who eats ripe grapes and drinks *old wine*." The antithesis forbids that the words should be applied in any other way. I am not aware that the word מְגִפְתּוֹ, *megitto*, appears in connection with יַיִן, *yayin*, as a descriptive qualification any where in the sacred writings, but as גַּת, *gath*, signifies a wine-press, and the word occurs in the plural in Neh. xiii, 15, and is there translated *wine-presses*, it seems that this term יֵין מְגִפְתּוֹ, *yayin megitto*, was used to signify *raw wine*, *new wine*, *wine recently from the press*. The use of this figure of speech would likewise indicate that this article was not considered as possessed of much merit, or an article in common use.

While the Mishna is very explicit in the instructions for the observance of the passover, and in these instructions expressly includes wine, yet it is worthy of remark that the use of wine at the paschal feast was not enjoined by the law, but was sanctioned by the especial notice given to it by our Saviour in the institution of the Lord's Supper, so that, whatever position it may take as part of the type, it becomes part of the seal and memorial of our Saviour's sufferings and death. Being considered as part of a sacrificial offering and feast, however, such wine would be used as was commonly used at such feasts and sacrifices at the temple. Calmet says of יֵין נְסִיכָם, *yayin nesikam*, the wine of libation, "That it was the most excellent wine poured on the victims in the temple of the Lord, or pure wine, because in libations they used no mixtures." In the command given for the perpetual sacrifice, morning and evening, (Exod. xxix, 39–42,) the wine is designated by the word יַיִן, *yayin*, and in the directions given in the Hebrew rituals, the word שֵׁכָר, *shekar*, is used. This would indicate that the wine used in the perpetual sacrifice was possessed, at least, of

the generally received characteristics of wine; that is, it had gone through the regular process of vinous fermentation, since the word שֵׁכָר, *shekar*, means invariably strong drink, and is so translated, not only in the Bible, but also in the "Prayers of Israel." In the command for the presentation of the first-fruits and the accompanying drink-offering, (Lev. xxiii, 13.) יַיִן, *yayin*, is again mentioned, thus indicating that the *general* wine of Judea must be tithed to the Lord, and must be thankfully received in his name, since there is no special instruction as to the kind of wine to be used. In the general directions given for the offerings of other sacrifices (Num. xv, 5) יַיִן, *yayin*, is again used to designate the wine for the drink-offering. In the general directions given for burnt-offerings in the continual morning and evening sacrifice, in Num. xxviii, 7, the word שֵׁכָר, *shekar*, is used, and is rendered in our translation "*strong wine*," thus establishing the fact that *strength* was no bar to the offering of wine to the God of Israel. In the offering of tithes of first-fruits (Deut. xviii, 4) the word used for wine is תִּירוֹשׁ, *tirosh*, and in the blessings promised to those who fulfill this command, (Prov. iii, 9, 10,) תִּירוֹשׁ, *tirosh*, is again used in the expression, "And thy presses shall *burst out* with *new wine*." These passages will be sufficient to establish the fact that first-fruits of תִּירוֹשׁ, *tirosh*, were offered *annually* at the Temple, and that daily *morning* and *evening*, as well as *other sacrificial offerings*, were made of יַיִן, *yayin*, or שֵׁכָר, *shekar*. These, then, were common wines of Judea, were used in sacrifice, especially *yayin* and *shekar*, and received the divine sanction.

Now let us see what effects are attributed to them in the sacred writings. The allusions to the effects of תִּירוֹשׁ, *tirosh*, are confined to a single passage, but that is a most decisive one, namely, Hosea iv, 11: "Whoredom and wine (יַיִן, *yayin*) and *new wine* (תִּירוֹשׁ, *tirosh*) take away the heart." In this passage *tirosh* appears as the climax of engrossing influence, in immediate connection with *yayin*. Dr. Clarke says on this passage, "These darken the understanding, deprave the judgment, pervert the will, debase all the passions," etc. There is a passage in Acts xi, 13, having allusion to the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, "These men are full of *new wine*," (γλεῦκος, *gleukos*;) and this term will be understood by Peter's re-

ply in the 15th verse, where the word *μεθυούσιν*, *methuousin*, derived from *μέθυ*, *methu*, signifying wine, and which is applied to the effects which the Jews supposed resulted from an intemperate use of *gleukos*, is used. It is worthy of notice that "*new wine*" in this passage is translated in the modern Hebrew New Testament by the word תִּירוֹשׁ, *tirosh*. Schleusner says of *gleukos* in this passage, "Semel legitur in N. T. Act. ii, 13, *γλεύκους μεμεσῖωμένοι εισί*, *vino dulci* (*non musto;* vindemiam enim in mensem Tisri cecidisse apud Judæos, satis notum est) pleni sunt."* In Job xxxii, 19, the word *wine* is translated from the Hebrew יַיִן, *yayin*, by the word *γλεύκους*, *gleukous*, in the Septuagint. The reading of the passage will convince every one of the character of תִּירוֹשׁ, *Tirosh*. But the particular point to which I wish to call attention is this: In the Hebrew New Testament *γλεύκους*, *gleukous*, is translated תִּירוֹשׁ, *tirosh*, and in the Septuagint יַיִן, *yayin*, is translated *γλεύκους*, *gleukous*. Things that are equal to the same thing are equal to each other. *Tirosh* must partake of the same nature as *yayin*, but *yayin* and *shekar* are used interchangeably in the divine command. *Shekar* is *strong wine*. By this grouping of facts one can easily understand why *tirosh* "*takes away the heart.*" Parkhurst says of this passage: "*Sweet wine*—which distills of its own accord from the grapes, which is the *sweetest* and smoothest—the juice of the grape before it is trodden. If it be asked how there could be any *γλεύκος*, *gleukos*, or *sweet wine*, at Pentecost, it may be sufficient to reply that it appears both from the heathen and Jewish writers, cited by Wetstein on Acts ii, 13, (whom see,) that the ancients had a method of preserving the *sweetness*, and, by consequence, the *strongly inebriating quality* of the *γλεύκος*, for a long time." Robinson says of *γλεύκος*, *gleukos:* "In N. T. *sweet wine*, fermented and intoxicating, Acts ii, 13. Comp. v, 15, Sept., for יַיִן, *yayin*, Job xxxii, 19." Leigh, in *Critica Sacra*, says,† "Alii vertunt, Vino dulci pleni erant—sed quum hæc gesta sunt die Pentecostes, *quo tempore nullum est mustum.*" Arius

* "Once it is written in the N. T., Acts ii, 13: They are full of *sweet wine*, (*not must*, or unfermented juice, since it is to be observed that the vintage among the Jews occurred in the month Tisri.")

† "Others render, 'were full of sweet wine,' but when these things were done it was the day of Pentecost, *at which time there is no must*," over seven months having elapsed since the preceding vintage.

Montanus, in "Sac. App. Antwerp Polyglott," gives the definition of "γλεύκος, *gleukos*,* mustum, vinum, and succus dulcis," indicating that these terms were not synonymous. This will, however, suffice to give a tolerably clear understanding that while *gleukos* may mean *must*, yet that the weight of evidence leads us to the belief that *gleukos*, which is translated and used as the equivalent of *tirosh* and *yayin*, could and did intoxicate, and was understood to be an intoxicating liquor by critics.

Perhaps before I pass to the consideration of the next word, *yayin*, I should call attention to the fact that in the Peshito Syriac New Testament, after the word ܚܡܪܐ, *meritho*, which is the Syriac equivalent of תִּירוֹשׁ, *tirosh*, and γλεῦκος, *gleukos*, according to Ari. Mon., in "Sac. App.," and which is defined by Gutbir as "merum," pure wine, without mixture or alloy; or, as Ainsworth has it, "racy, neat wine," the Syriac word *arcia* (and *are intoxicated*) is appended. The same word which is rendered *well drunken* in John ii, 10, in the description of our Saviour's miracle in Cana.

To יַיִן, *yayin*, are attributed the "darkly flashing eye." Gen. xlix, 12, "red;" but see "Gesen. Thes. Append.," p. 89; "the unbridled tongue" and "error of judgment," Prov. xx, 1; Isa. xxviii, 7; "the excitement and inflammation of the spirit," Prov. xxxi, 6; Isa. v, 11; Zech. ix, 15; x, 7; "the perverted judgment and debased affections of its votaries," Hosea iv, 11; "the indecent exposure," Hab. ii, 15, 16; and "the sickness resulting from the *heat* of wine," Hosea vii. 5. חֲמַת יַיִן, *chemath meyayin*, translated in our version "bottles of wine," as חֲמַת, *chemath*, is likewise used in Gen. xxi, 15, 19, and v, 14, to signify a *leathern bottle*, a *water skin;* but in Job xxi, 20, and Hosea vii, 5, to designate *heat*, *anger*, but translated, as I have said, in the authorized version of the Scriptures "bottles of wine"—see Gesen.—a very significant fact in relation to the use of "leathern bottles." As *yayin* occurs so very frequently in the Holy Scriptures, I have only quoted the more pronounced allusions to the effects which it produced, showing that *yayin* would and did intoxicate, and its abuse would produce drunkenness with all its attendant evils.

In Isa. xxviii the word שִׁכּוֹר, *shikkori*, is used in the 1st and 3d verses to designate *drunkards*, and in the 7th verse שִׁכָּרוֹן

* Must, wine and sweet juice.

shekar, is used with *yayin* to denote the cause of the error and backsliding of Israel. In this verse *yayin* occurs twice and *shekar* three times, and is translated *strong drink*. In Lev. x, 9, the priests are forbidden to use wine, *yayin*, and *shekar*, strong drink, in the performance of priestly service in the Tabernacle, conveying the impression that it was through the improper use of wine and strong drink that Nadab and Abihu offered strange fire unto the Lord, and died in their disobedience.

The word *shekar* seems to have been applied to *intoxicating* or *inebriating liquor* in general, and *as such included* the יין, *yayin*, of the sacrifices. So that when *shekar* is used to designate the wine used in the daily sacrifice in Num. xxviii, 7, it shows that when *yayin* was *shekar*, strong drink, it was acceptable to God when properly offered, that all *yayin* was *shekar*, or that *shekar*, in the sense of all intoxicating drinks, was acceptable to God in sacrifice. One or more of these conclusions seems unavoidable. I will not, however, press the matter beyond the statement that "the impression produced on the mind by this review of the biblical use of the terms is that both *yayin* and *tirosh*, in their ordinary and popular acceptation, referred to fermented, intoxicating wine. In all the condemnatory passages in the Bible no exception is made in favor of any other kind of liquid passing under the same name, but not invested with the same dangerous qualities. Nor, again, in these passages is there any decisive condemnation of the substance itself, which would enforce the conclusion that elsewhere an unfermented liquid must be understood. The condemnation must be understood of *excessive use* in any case; for even where this is not expressed it is implied; and, therefore, the instances of wine being drunk without any reproof of the act may, with as great a probability, imply the moderate use of an intoxicating beverage as the use of an unintoxicating one." As my present inquiry does not, however, include the examination of all Bible wines, nor the allusions made to them in the sacred Scriptures, but only those which were permissible in sacrifice, and especially the paschal solemnities, if it be true that the Lord's Supper was instituted during the celebration of them, or if it be true that the Lord's Supper was instituted at a common meal before the celebration of the Passover, the

wines which were in common use, according to divine law, in Judea at that time, must have been used.

It thus far appears, from biblical sanction, that *wine*, in its generally accepted sense, was *permissible* in these solemnities, since in no sense prohibited or proscribed by law, but sanctioned by divine acceptance in the Temple, in their daily religious service, and made an indispensable accompaniment in all their holocausts. Moreover, it was used from the earliest times, according to the Mishna, with no other regulation than that it be פְּרִי הַגֶּפֶן, *peri haggephen*, the fruit of the vine. Unless it can be proved that *all* the *passovers* were celebrated with the *unfermented* juice of the grape, kept from the general vintage of from the middle of September or November—for this vintage continued about that long—to the fourteenth day from the first new moon of April, in such quantities that every person celebrating it could at least have four cups, all the arguments in favor of the unfermented juice of the grape must fail.* If the *unfermented* juice of the grape was to be used during the *paschal supper only*, there would have been some mention of that fact, as of the bread required; if it was to be used during the entire feast of unleavened bread, it would necessitate the opening of new bottles of the unfermented juice, if it were possible to keep it so, for every day in that warm climate, which, in the absence of special accommodations and arrangements, and especially of all mention of such requirements in the ritual of that ceremony-loving people, seems to be an impossibility. If, as the Greek Church maintains, the Lord's Supper was instituted at a common meal preceding the paschal supper, it would necessitate the *common use* of this *unfermented juice* in order to support the theory of the use of *unfermented* wine in the institution of the Lord's Supper, and that in the face of all biblical notices and commands in reference to that which did intoxicate, without one allusion to this fact, which is, to say the least of it, absurd.

* The enormous amount of wine used in these services will appear when we consider that every male must be present, and they were accustomed in addition to take their families with them, (see Luke ii, 41, 42,) and every one must have four cups of wine! Josephus says, in A. D. 65, (War ii, 14. 3:) "3,000,000 Jews were present; and at the feast in the reign of Nero, 2,700,000, when 256,500 lambs were slain.—*Ib.*, vi, 9, 3. *Twelve million cups of unfermented wine in one evening of the feast!!!* Scarcely possible! And that six months after the vintage!

The vintage commences in Syria (I quote from Jahn's *Bib. Archæ.*) about the middle of September and continues until the middle of November. But grapes in Palestine, we are informed, were ripe as early as June or July, which probably arose from a triple pruning, in which case there was also a third vintage. The first vintage was usually in August, the second in September, and the third usually in October. Grapes sometimes remained on the vines until November and December. The *must*, or new wine, as is still customary in the East, was preserved in large vessels, which were buried in the earth. The store-houses for wine were not subterranean, but built upon the earth. When deposited in these, the vessels, as is done at the present time in Persia, were sometimes buried in the ground and sometimes left standing upon it. Formerly, also, new wine was preserved in leathern bottles, and, lest they should burst during fermentation, the people were careful that the bottles should be new. See Job xxxii, 19; Matt. ix, 17; Mark ii, 22. The earliest wines were, doubtless, in all cases simple and pure, being obtained by mere expression and fermentation of the grape juice; but modifications in the way of increasing the saccharine element, by partial drying of the grapes, and of aiding the development of alcohol by heat, began very early to be introduced. Leaves and aromatic substances were infused in the expressed grape juice, additions were made of various resins, and, in order to give body and flavor to certain wines that would otherwise be thin and poor, a portion of must concentrated by boiling was, as at the present day, added to the fermenting juice. The very sweet wines of the present, or modern times, are produced by previously boiling the must to a considerable degree of thickness, or the grapes are left very long on the vines, and, by twisting the stalks, the access of fresh sap is checked and evaporation from the grapes allowed until they shrivel and appear like raisins. The extent to which the must will go on fermenting, if immediately bottled or put in casks, endangering the bursting of these, depends on the oxygen already in the liquid. It may be added that the fermentation is more prompt and satisfactory as the quantity of must in the vat is greater; and that the covering of the vats, by the preventing the escape of the carbonic acid, alcohol, and aroma, tends greatly to preserve the proper strength and quality of the

wine. Dr. Jahn tells us, in *Bib. Archæ.*, that the grapes of Palestine are mostly red or black, whence originated the phrase "blood of grapes," דַּם עֲנָבִים, *dam aonabim*. See Gen. xlix, 11; Deut. xxxii, 14; Isa. xxvii, 2.

Dr. Justin Perkins says, in "A Residence of Eight Years in Persia," p. 437:

The juice of the grape is used in three ways in Persia. When simply expressed it is called "sweet," that is, sweet liquor. It is not drunk in that state, nor regarded as fit for use, any more than new, unsettled cider at the press in America.*† *Nor is it called wine till it is fermented.* A second and very extensive use of the juice of the grape is the syrup, made from boiling it from this sweet state, which resembles our molasses, and is used in the same way for sweetening, but is never used as a drink. This is, in fact, neither more nor less than oriental molasses. The third use of the juice of the grape is the distillation of it into arrack, or Asiatic brandy. The wines of Persia are, in general, much lighter than those of Europe, but they are still always intoxicating. Rev. Benjamin Labaree, Jun., writes to his father, Dr. Labaree, late President of Middlebury College, after a residence of seven years as a missionary among the Nestorians: "With the most careful inquiries I have been unable to learn that any wine is ever manufactured in the country which is not intoxicating. The various kinds made differ more or less in their intoxicating powers, but all are fermented, and all, sooner or later, produce the same effect. The simple unfermented juice of the grape is never used as a beverage. The very Syriac word *chemro*, by its etymology, signifies fermented." Dr. Eli Smith, long a resident in Syria, and to whom "Robinson's Biblical Researches" are largely indebted for their minute and accurate information, gives an account of the wines of Mount Lebanon in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, in which he says: "The methods of making wine in Lebanon may be reduced to three: (*a*) The must is fermented without desiccation or boiling. Little is made in this way, and, except in cool localities, it does not keep well, though possessing rather strong intoxicating powers. (*b*) The must is boiled down about four or five per cent. and then fermented. (*c*) The grapes are dried in the sun from four to five days, till the stems are dry; they are then pressed, and must, skins, stems, and all are put into open jars to ferment about a month. This wine keeps

* Is it true that new cider is not considered fit for use in America? We suspect that thousands would drink no other.—Ed.

† This use of the word *cider* has scarcely a warrant in the present popular use of the term among us, but it was not so originally understood. Dr. A. Clarke, in his comment on Lev. x, 9, says: "From the original word, probably, we have borrowed our term *cider*, or *sider*, which among us *exclusively signifies the fermented juice of apples*." So also M'Clintock & Strong, Encyclo., Art. "Wine," Div. Vayra.

better, and will sometimes burn, but it is only about one third of the weight of the grapes that are used in making it. The best wines yield thirty-three per cent. of what is called good brandy. Wines are never enforced with brandy, but unintoxicating wines I have not been able to hear of. All wines, they say, intoxicate more or less. So, when inquiring for unfermented wine, I have uniformly been met with a stare of surprise. The very idea seems to be regarded as an absurdity. The name for wine in Arabic, *chamr*, חַמְר, *chemer*, is derived from the verb to ferment. I have not been able to learn that any process is ever adopted for arresting vinous fermentation before it is completed."

Dr. C. V. A. Van Dyck, who has been for more than a quarter of a century in Syria, says, in answer to Dr. Laurie:

In reply to your question about wine for communion there is not, and, as far as I can find out, never was (in Syria) any thing like what has been called unfermented wine. The thing is not known in the East. Syrup is made of the juice of the grape, and molasses, as you know, but nothing that is called wine. They have no unfermented drinks but water of licorice root. Raisins are sometimes soaked till they swell, and are then eaten and the water drank; but it is never called wine or supposed to be related to wine. In Syria, and, as far as I can learn, in all the East, there is no wine preserved unfermented, and they never make wine of raisins, but they do make דִּבְשׁ, *dibs*, or molasses, of raisins, and they ferment them and make arrack of them, (by distillation,) *but they could not keep grape juice or raisin water unfermented if they would.* It would become either wine or vinegar in a few days, or go into putrefactive fermentation. At the passover only fermented wine is used; as I have said before, there is no other, and, therefore, they have no idea of any other. From the above you can easily infer my judgment as to the proper wine for the sacrament. The same as the blessed Saviour used when he instituted the ordinance, namely, the juice of the grape so fermented as to be capable of producing intoxication when taken in sufficient quantity. The wines of the East differ in the percentage of alcohol which they contain, but all the various kinds are used by the native Churches and by the Jews. They take that which chances to be at hand, just as the Saviour took that which was at hand at the passover.—*Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan., 1869.

Thomas M'Mullen, in his "Hand-Book of Wines," says in relation to "*dibs*:"

This compound *originated* in the prohibition placed upon the use of fermented and intoxicating liquors by the Mohammedan religion. The grape juice, therefore, *instead of being converted*

into wine, is chiefly boiled down to a syrup, which, under the name of "dibs," is much used in the East by all classes, where there are vineyards, *as a condiment with their food*. The grape juice is put into large boilers and reduced to one half or possibly one third of the original quantity. It is then removed to large earthen jars and subjected to a process not unlike churning, which is repeated for a few days until it thickens. *When properly churned or beaten* but little separation of the particles takes place. *It is represented to be a pleasant article for table use, and decidedly preferable to molasses.* The name "dibs," by which it is known in the East, is said to be the same as the original Hebrew word which in many passages of Scripture is rendered honey.—P. 146.

In reference to "boiled wines" he says:

The must is placed over a clear fire, with as little smoke as possible. The wine must be boiled until it is reduced to one-third of its original quantity. It is then skimmed and poured into clean wooden vessels to remain until cool, after which it is to be barreled up close. This wine is very pleasant to the taste, of a deep amber color, delicate, and *generous*. Boiling is also adopted to make new wine have the appearance of old. For this purpose it is raised in temperature close to the boiling point, barreled and bunged up directly, *and in three months it is found possessed of the character of wine kept for some years.*—P. 148.

Dr. Jahn (in *Bib. Archæ.*) says:

Wine, although very rich in Eastern climates, was sometimes mixed with spices, especially myrrh, and this mixture was named from a Hebrew word which signifies *mixed*. This word, namely, מָהוּל, *mahul*, means also a wine diluted with water, which was given to the buyer *instead of good wine*, and was, consequently, used figuratively for any kind of adulteration. Wine in the East was frequently diluted after it was bought. There is a sort of wine called שֵׁכָר, *shekar*, σικερα, *sikera*, or *strong drink*. It was made of dates and of various seeds and roots, and was sufficiently powerful to occasion intoxication. It was drank mixed with water. From the pure wine and "*sikera*" there was made an artificial beverage חֹמֶץ, *homets*, which was taken at meals with vegetables and bread. Ruth ii, 14. It was also a common drink. (Num. vi, 3,) and was used by the Roman soldiers. Further there is a wine called by the Talmudists *vinegar*, whence the passage in Matt. xxviii, 34, may be explained.

Dr. Clarke says, (Commentary, Prov. ix, 5; Isa. i, 22:)

Among the ancient Jews, Greeks, and Romans wine was rarely drank without being mingled with water; and among ancient writers we find several ordinances for this. Some direct three

parts of water to one of wine; some five parts; and Pliny mentions some wines that required twenty waters; but the most common proportions appear to have been three parts of water to two of wine. It is remarkable that whereas the Greeks and Latins by *mixed wine* always understood wine diluted and lowered with water, the Hebrews, on the contrary, mean by it a wine *made stronger and more inebriating* by the addition of higher and more powerful ingredients, such as *honey*, *spices*, *defrutum*, (or wine inspissated by boiling it down to two thirds or one half the quantity,) myrrh, mandragora, opiates, and other strong drugs. This יין כמסך, *yayin masach*, mingled wine, however, was not permissible in the sacrifices, nor would our Saviour receive this drink-offering when offering up himself as a sacrifice for us; but that the paschal wine was mingled with water seems very probable from the directions to be found in the Mishna in relation to a pan to be used for the warming of water.

In alluding to the various sacrifices, offerings, and oblations, Dr. Clarke, on Lev. vii, says of מסך, *mesech*, and ממסך, *mimsach*, that "it is a mixture-offering, or *mixed libation*, called a *drink*-offering, Isa. lv, 11, from מסך, *masach*, to mingle; it seems in general to mean *old wine mixed with the lees*, which made it *extremely intoxicating*. This offering does not appear to have had any place in the worship of the true God; but, from Isa. lxv, 11, and Prov. xxiii, 30, it seems to have been used for idolatrous purposes, such as the Bacchanalia among the Greeks and Romans, 'when all got drunk in honor of the god.'" נסך, *nesech*, libation or drink-offering from נסך, *nasach*, to diffuse or pour out, consisted of water or wine poured out at the conclusion or confirmation of a treaty or covenant. To this kind of offering there is frequent allusion and reference in the New Testament, *as it typified the blood of Christ poured out for the sin of the world;* and to this our Lord himself alludes in the institution of the Eucharist. In this libation, as I have already shown, יין, *yayin*, or שֵׁכָר, *shekar*, were used by special divine command. This wine seems to have been mixed with water in the paschal solemnities, and in all probability was so diluted in the "cup of blessing" used in the institution of the Lord's Supper.

Calmet says, "The wines of Palestine being heady, they used to qualify them with water that they might be drank without inconvenience. Prov. ix, 2, 5." The word *must*, from the Latin *mustum*, seems to have been derived from the same

word which is used to designate the *unleavened bread* of the Passover, namely, *matsoth*, from the root מָץ, *mats*, to press or squeeze out, in general *separate*, or from מִשְׁתֶּה, *mish'th*, a drink, or a banquet. See Esther v, 4; vii, 2, 8; Dan. i, 10; Ezra iii, 7. Since this word was used to *designate unleavened bread*, and might with equal appropriateness have been applied to the wine, *if there was the same restriction to the wine, it seems to me that it would have been so applied.**

יַיִן, *yayin*, as Dr. Lees admits, ("Preliminary Dissertation,") "was also applied to every species of *fermented* grape juice;" but adds: "*Yayin*, then, being accepted as a general term, it would follow that we should expect, as time went on, that *specific* terms would be adopted to designate special kinds or states of wine, and this is exactly what we find to be the case in the later books." Just so, but in a case of such vital importance the divine sanction in the sacrificial offerings would be most carefully guarded if Dr. Lees' position was tenable, instead of which *yayin* and *shekar are used interchangeably* in the wording of the divine command instituting the sacrifice. Gesenius, in defining יַיִן, *yayin*, says: 1. *Wine*, so called from its *fermenting*, effervescing; as חֶמֶר, *chemer*, from חָמַר, *chamar*. 2. Meton., of cause for effect, *wine* for *drunkenness*, *intoxication*. Gen. ix, 24; 1 Sam. i, 14; xxv, 37. Parkhurst says: יָנָה, *to press*, *squeeze*, *oppress*, *depress*, (see root נא with mutable ה,) as a יַיִן, *wine*, which is made by squeezing the grapes, the expressed juice of grapes, (to be understood as *wine*, as in fourteen quoted languages.) Davidson says: יַיִן, *yayin*, from יָיִן, *yavan*, root not used; to which is ascribed the signification of *heat and fermentation*.

Leigh says of its Chaldee equivalent, (in *Critica Sacra*,) חֲמַר, *chamar*, *Turbidus*, *lutulentus*, *turbatus*, *conturbatus*, *commixtus*, *commixtus*, *confusus fuit*. (Wild, confused, disordered, thick, turbid, muddy, confused, disturbed, excited, intermingled, poured together, confounded, bewildered.)

Clement C. Moore derives יַיִן from יָנָה, *yanah*, to press. So Castell, who says: יַיִן, *vinum*, a יָנָה, *torquit*, (to grow mouldy,

* According to Maimonides and all the Rabbins, "the juice of fruits does not leaven, but purifies, and the '*cherosel*' itself was made of the palm-tree branches or of raisins, or other like berries; which they stamped, and put *vinegar* thereto," etc. See Maimonides on leaven, s. ii.

become *torpid or stupefied*,) ortum a יגה, *obtorpuit, somnolentus* fuit, quod torpidos vinum largius justo haustum facit et somnolentos. (Benumbs, stupefies, makes sleepy, because larger draughts of wine than suitable or proper stupefy the drinkers and make them slumber.) Michaelis, in Comment., says: * יָגָה, *yanah*, torpuit, enervavit, oppressit, perdidit. Verbum in *oppromendi, injuriæque*, ac *violentiæ* significatione notissimum, quod Syris prorsus periit, habent Arabes sub ي ن ى, torpuit, unde vino nomen ductum esse, supra sub יַיִן conjecimus. Ab quomodo huic Hebraica verbi הוּגָה in Hiphil notis, fluxerit, non satis liquet; conjecturæ licentia se detur, conferenda quarta Arabum conjugatio, in qua ى ن ى, est, *debilitavit, defatigavit*, unde dicta oppressio, etc.

Buxtorf says: † יַיִן, *vinum.* Vinum lætificat cor hominis, Psa. civ, 15; vino errant, Ies. xxviii, 7; vinum convivii ipsorum, Dan. i, 16; bibe animo hilari vinum tuum, Eccles. ix, 7.

Simonis says: ‡ יַיִן, rad, inusit, cujus nullum in dialectis vestigium sed videtur inde, יָנַן et יָנִן orriri, quemadmodum חָמַר et חֻמַּר (חֻמַּר) ex uno fonte profluent; which root, namely, *yavan*, יָנַן, Gesenius says, means to boil up, to be in a ferment.

יַיִן, *vinum*, § Gen. xix, 32–34; Lev. x, 9; Num. vi, 3, etc. Metonym. de *crapula*. Gen. ix, 24; 1 Sam. i, 14, etc., etc.

Gibbs says: ‖ יַיִן, *wine: intoxication*, and Arius Montan., in *Sac. App.*, of יצת, *sicut vinum inebrians*, a יַיִן, *id est* vinum. ¶

* "It stupefies, enervates, oppresses, destroys. A word which especially has the signification of oppressing, doing violence, and working injury, which the Syrians generally render *to destroy*, and the Arabs have interpreted by the word *wanch*, to *stupefy*, whence the word *wine* is to be derived, as we have remarked under the word *yayin*. Although the meaning of the word '*honah*' in Hiphil is not sufficiently clear in itself, by a comparison with the fourth Arabic conjugation, the word *Oonch* is found, which signifies '*it has debilituted, it has wearied*,' whence the word oppression."

† *Yayin*, "wine which delights the heart of man." Psa. civ, 15. "They erred by wine." Isa. xxviii, 7. "The wine of their feasts," or, as in our version, "the wine that they should drink." Dan. i, 16. "Drink thy wine with a merry heart." Eccl. ix, 7.

‡ *Yavan*, root unused, of which there is no trace in the language; ("a common thing in Hebrew lexicography,") but evidently the source whence *yayin* and *yaven* arise in the same manner as *khomer* and *khemer* flow from the one source, *khamar*.

§ *Yayin*, wine, by metonymy, concerning drunkenness.

‖ *Yanah*, as wine that makes drunk, that is, *yayin*, or wine.

¶ Pliny says: "De vino: Fervet vinum cum ex musto in vinum transit." The wine boils up *when it passes from must into wine.*

Having thus briefly examined the authorities at hand in reference to *yayin*,* let us see what is said about *shekar*.

In the consideration of the word שֵׁכָר, Dr. Lees, in his "Preliminary Dissertation," in trying to maintain the definition he gives, "*saccharine drink*," quotes himself, because, I suppose, there was nobody else to quote, and intimates that Dr. Fuerst is the only lexicographer to combat on his position. Gesenius says: "שֵׁכָר, *shekar*, *temetum*, *strong drink*, any *intoxicating* liquor, whether wine, (Num. xxviii, 7,) or an *intoxicating* drink resembling wine, prepared or distilled from barley, from honey, or from dates. Arab. سكر, *sikkar*, wine prepared from dried grapes and dates." Parkhurst says, "*intoxicating* or *inebriating liquor* in general, *sicera*. It is once used for *wine*, (Num. xxviii, 7; comp. Exod. xxix, 40,) but most commonly for *any inebriating* liquor beside wine. So *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, and *Theodotion* render it in Isa. xxviii, 7, by *methusma* μεθυσμα. Lev. x, 9; Num. vi, 3; and al freq. *Jerome*, in *Epist. ad Nepotianum de vita Clericorum*, and in Isa. xxviii, 1, informs us that in Hebrew *any inebriating liquor* is called *sicera*." Davidson says: *Shekar*, *strong*, *intoxicating drink*, from שָׁכַר. 1. *To drink to the full*, *drink to hilarity*. 2. *To be intoxicated*: Metaph., *to be giddy*. Bi. and Hiph., *to make drunken*. Hith. p., *to act like one drunken*." Leigh, in *Critica Sacra*,† says: "שֵׁכָר, Sicera omnis potus inebrians vel sitim expleus etiam vinum. Sed quando vino jemgitur notat vinum factitium ex pomis aut aliis fructibus: aut etiam hordeo. Lev. x, 9. *Shekar* is all manner of *strong drink which will make drunken*. The Greek turneth it *wine*. Psa. lxviii, 15, and Prov. xxxi, 4." Castell says:‡ "*Sicera inebrians potus*, vid. Chald., Lev. x, 9, etc., et *vinum vetus*, vid. Onkelos, Jonathan. Num. vi, 3; cap. xxviii, 7; Deut. xiv, 26; Aben. Esr. i; Reg. xvi, 9; Syr. Cum. Eccl. xxxi, 28; Syr. St. Luc. v, 39, etc., etc." Michaelis says:§ "Jam atiam locis Mosaicis quæ שֵׁכָר et יַיִן conjungunt, ut

* So Avernarius, Calasius, Hasselbauer, Cocceius, Stockius, Castell, Schindler, etc.

† Sicera, all intoxicating drinks, either satisfying thirst or wine, but it is to be noted that this wine comprehends all factitious wines from fruits grown on trees and other fruits, and likewise that from grain.

‡ "Sicera is an inebriating drink, etc., and old wine."

§ "Now likewise in the places in the books of Moses in which *shekar* and *yayin* are joined together, as in Lev. x, 9; Num. vi, 3, is to be understood

Lev. x, 9; Num. vi, 3. Cerevisiam cogitandum esse vix dubium, quid enim veri similius quam Mosen *a potu inebriante* interdicturum populo in Ægypto cerevisiæ adsueto, hanc sub שֵׁכָר intellexisse. Accedit quod ita intellexerunt Rabbini." Buxtorf says,* "שֵׁכָר, *inebriativum, inebrians potus*, qui Græcis hinc vocatus σικέρα, Latinis, *sicera*." "Aben Esra scribit senter, xiv, esse *potum fortem* factitium, ex melle et dactylis, aut trotico et hordeo." Gibbs has, *Shekar, strong* or *intoxicating drink;* Moore, *strong drink, strong wine;* and Arius Montanus says,† "*Et ab inebriando* vinum שֵׁכָר sechar *vocatur* Inebriatiuum: Isaiæ v, 11. *Tharg.*, Vinum vetus, etc., Lev. x, 8, ubi שֵׁכָר *comprehendit quicquid inebriat, præter vinum.*" Verily, Dr. Fuerst stands in a goodly company. I know of no lexicographer who differs from these definitions in the main. *Tirosh* now remains to be examined.

Dr. Lees says that "תִּירוֹשׁ, *tirosh*, is not 'wine' at all, but 'the fruit of the vineyard' in its natural condition," *namely, grapes. Grapes could not be drunk at the paschal supper, so Dr. Lees would vote tirosh out altogether.* But, in order to hold his position, he says that "nothing but a foregone conclusion, fostered by the mistranslation of ancient and modern versions—versions which traditionally sustain and deceive each other—could have hindered scholars from perceiving the true sense of this word. Neither versions nor lexicons, however, have been consistent." It is not absolutely necessary that this word should be considered in reference to the paschal supper, but if *tirosh* meant the vintage of the current year, it might have been, and perhaps partially was, used in these solemnities. Yayin, apparently, covers the whole ground, as *tirosh* was *yayin* and yayin might be, and frequently was, *shekar*. In other words, the *vintage of the current year* was *wine*, and

scarcely a doubt, the liquor of cereals, such as ale, beer, because the command was similar to the interdiction placed by Moses upon *an intoxicating drink* made of cereals, to which the people in Egypt were accustomed, which was known by the term *shekar*. Moreover, this was so understood by the Rabbins."

* "*Shekar*, that which makes drunk, an intoxicating drink, which the Greeks call *sikera*, and the Latins *sicera*. Aben Ezra writes, Deut. xiv, that it is a *strong* factitious drink made from honey and raisins, or wheat and barley."

† "And from intoxicating wine, sechar is called that which inebriates. Isa. v, 11. Targum, 'old wine,' and Lev. x, 8, where *shekar* comprehends whatever intoxicates beside wine."

wine was *strong drink*. This seems to be sufficiently clear, but the maintainance of this is not necessary to my position, which is that the wines in common use in Judea could and did intoxicate, and that such wines were used for libations at the altar of sacrifices with the sanction of the God of Israel, and, in all probability, were used in the paschal solemnities and at the institution of the Lord's Supper. But let us consider what these recalcitrant scholars say of *tirosh*.

Gesenius says: "תִּירוֹשׁ, *tirosh*, (יָרַשׁ,) *new wine*, so called (*i.e.*, *tirosh*) because *it gets possession of the brain*, and *inebriates*." —*Com. Syr. Meritho.* Chald. מֵירַת, *merath*, id, Hosea iv, 11, etc., etc. (All the passages go to show that *tirosh* is *new wine* of the first year, the *wine crop* or vintage of the season; and hence it is mostly coupled with wine and oil as a product of the land. That it was regarded as *intoxicating* is shown by Hosea iv, 11, as above.)

Parkhurst says: "New wine, so called (namely, *tirosh*) from its *strongly intoxicating* quality, by which it does, as it were, *take possession* of a man, and *drive* him *out* of himself, according to that of Hosea iv, 11. Comp. the following verse and Isa. xxviii, 7, and observe that in the text just cited from Hosea, LXX render *tirosh* by μεθυσμα, *methusma*, *drunkenness*; so Vulgate, by *ebrietas*." Davidson likewise derives *tirosh* from יָרַשׁ, with same signification. Leigh says: * "*Tirosh*, *mustum*, sic dictum quod potum hominem facilime possideat et occupet mentemque, è rectâ suâ sede expellat." Castell says: "*Tirosh*, *mustum*, Num. xviii, 12. Liquor uvarum primum expressus: *quod mentem hominis facile possidet.* Sanhedr. LXX, 1; Isaiah, lxxvi, 2." Simonis says: "*Tirosh*, *mustum*. Gen. xxvii, 28, 37. Num. xviii, 12; Deut. xxviii, 51; Hosea ii, 11; Jes. lxv. 8. Syr. *meritho*, sic dictum, quod *se possessorem* hominis facit, ejus cerebrum *occupando*, ut ille non amplius sui compos sit, sec. illud, Hosea iv, 11, etc., etc." Buxtorf says: "*Tirosh*, *mustum*, sed dictum, quod potem, *hominem facillime possideat et*

* "Tirosh, mustum, so called, because it most easily seizes and occupies the *mind* of man, and expels it from its rightful throne. Castell says: 'The juice first expressed from the grape which easily possesses the mind of men.' Simonis says: 'Tirosh, mustum. Syriac meritho, so called, because it takes possession of man, seizing his brain, so that he is not fully of sound mind.' Buxtorf says: 'Tirosh, must, so called, because it is a drink which most easily seizes and holds men and expels reason from her rightful throne.'"

occupet, mentemque e recta sua sede expellat." But it is needless to multiply authorities on this point.

The use of mixed wine is said to have been introduced by Pope Alexander I. It was expressly enacted in the twelfth century by Clement III. As early as the third century a sect called the *Aquarii* refused to offer any thing but water at the Eucharist, (Epiph. et Theod., likewise Bingham, Orig. Eccl., bk. xv, chap. xi, § 7.) The Manichæans also abstained wholly from wine. It is needless to say that these were strongly opposed by the teachers of all other parties. Pope Gelasius I., of the fifth century, called their practice "*grande sacrilegium.*" In M'Clintock & Strong's "Encyclopedia" the following observations are made on this subject: "The question as to whether the wine originally used in the Lord's Supper was *fermented* or not would seem to be a futile one in view of the fact, 1. That the unfermented juice of the grape can hardly with propriety be called *wine* at all. 2. That fermented wine is of almost universal use in the East; and, 3. That it has invariably been employed for this purpose in the Church of all ages and countries. But for the excessive zeal of certain modern well-meaning reformers, the idea that our Lord used any other would hardly have gained the least currency." Pococke says, in his "Travels in Egypt," art. "The Religion of the Copts:" "In the Catholic Churches they must use wine, but in the others they use what they call zebib . . . Zebib is a sort of raisin wine. They put five rotolas of new grapes to five of water, or more grapes are used if they are older. It is left to steep seven days in winter and four in summer. The deacons strain it through two bags, one after another, to make it fine. This keeps seven years, and tastes like a sweet wine that is turned a little sour. They keep the zebib in a jar, and cover it closely so that no wind can come to it." According to the canons of the Coptic Church no other wine but the clear unadulterated juice of the grape can be used for the Eucharist. So particular are they on this point that they will permit none to prepare it but the ministers of the altar. The grapes are picked with great care, are bruised between the hands instead of being trodden under foot, and no one is permitted to touch them until the altar wine has been set aside. (See Renaudot, vol. i, pp. 176, 177.) The Copts will not celebrate the sacrament with wine

which has been purchased in a store, for the reason that it may not be pure. (*Ibid.*) The impure compounds which sometimes find their way to our sacramental tables through the carelessness of the officials whose duty it is to procure the wine for that service are a sad commentary upon the estimation in which that holy ordinance is held.

I will now briefly consider the bread to be used. Lord King, in his treatise on "The Primitive Church," says: "In some places, as in France and Africa, the communicants first made their offerings, presenting, according to their ability, *bread* or *wine*, or the like, as the first-fruits of their increase." "It being our duty," as Irenæus writes, "to offer unto God the first-fruits of his creatures, as Moses saith, 'Thou shalt not appear empty before the Lord.'" "Not as if God wanted these things, but to show our fruitfulness and gratitude unto him." Wherefore Cyprian thus severely blamed the rich matrons for their scanty oblation. "Thou art rich and wealthy," saith he, "and dost thou think duly to celebrate the Lord's Supper when thou refusest to give? Thou who comest to the sacrament without a sacrifice, what part canst thou have from the sacrifice which the poor offer up?" These offerings were employed to the relief of the poor and other uses of the Church; *and it seems probable that a sufficient quantity of that bread and wine was presented to the Bishop, or to him that officiated, to be employed for the sacramental elements.*" Perhaps no question has given rise to warmer dispute than that which touches the use of *leavened* or *unleavened* bread in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Cardinal Bona tells us that the use of leavened and unleavened bread was common in the Latin Church until the beginning of the tenth century, when unleavened bread became obligatory on all. According to the discipline of that Church the bread must be made of (*panis tritiveus*) wheat, must be unleavened, must be mixed with water, must be baked, not stewed, fried, or boiled. It is commonly held in that Church that when the Ebionite heretics taught that the precepts of the ancient law were binding upon Christian people, and that, in consequence, the Eucharist could not be celebrated at all unless the bread our Lord used, namely, *unleavened*, were employed, the Church also sanctioned the use of leavened bread to confound this teaching, and that this remained in force until

all traces of the Ebionites had died away. This statement has for its supporters several eminent theologians, among whom are Alexander of Hales, Duns Scotus, Bonaventure, Thomas Aquinas, etc. (See Card. Bona, *Rer. Liturg.*, lib. i, cap. xxiii, Kozma, 238; Neale, "Holy Eastern Church;" "On the Controversy Concerning the Azyones," vol. ii.) If we consider the Lord's Supper as part of the Passover, *unleavened* bread was certainly used; if as a common meal preceding it, then *leavened* bread was employed. The Latin Church holds to the one view, the Greek to the other; but both hold that the use of either is more a matter of discipline than dogma. The ancient Hebrews had several ways of baking bread. They often baked it under the ashes; so Abraham served the three angels. Gen. xviii, 6. *Huggoth* signifies loaves, much like our broad, thin cakes, which are baked under the ashes, or upon round copper plates, or in pans or stoves made for the purpose. The Hebrews, at their departure out of Egypt, made some of these unleavened loaves for their journey. Exodus xii, 39. Busbequius, "Constantinop.," p. 36, says, that in Bulgaria this sort of loaves is still very common. They are there called *lugaces*. As soon as they see a guest coming the women immediately make these unleavened loaves, which are baked under the ashes. The Hebrews and other Eastern people have an oven which they call *taanour*, like a large pitcher of gray stone, open at the top, in which they build a fire. When it is well heated they mix the flour with water until it is made into a paste, which they apply to the outside of the oven, which bakes it in an instant, and the bread is removed in thin, fine wafers. A third sort of bread used among the people of the East is baked in a great pitcher half full of flint stones, on which they cast the paste in the form of little flat cakes. This bread is white and smells well, but is good only for the day on which it is baked unless there be leaven mingled with it to preserve it longer. This is the most common way in Palestine. As the Hebrews generally made their bread very thin and in the form of little flat cakes or wafers, they did not cut it with a knife, but broke it; which gave rise to that expression so usual in Scripture of *breaking bread*, to signify eating, sitting down to table, making a meal. And so, in the institution of the Eucharist, our Saviour broke the bread which he had blessed. In the Latin Church the bread

is baked between heated irons, upon which is stamped the crucifixion, *Agnus dei*, or a simple cross. The instrument used for this purpose somewhat resembles a large forceps in appearance. It has two long handles, and at its extremities is a pair of circular heads, one overlapping the other. After this instrument has been sufficiently heated in the fire, a *little lard* or butter is rubbed over its surface to keep the paste from adhering. A thin coating of this paste is then spread over the surface of the under disk, and, the upper one being allowed to rest on it a moment or two, it is taken out perfectly baked. The irons are then separated, and the bread is taken out and trimmed for use. The Greek Church is very particular about the fabrication of the sacramental bread. They use leavened bread. The flour must always be kept in the church, where is also the oven in which it is baked. During the process of making the bread a constant chanting of psalms is kept up. The bread must be *new*, *fresh*, and *pure*, nor must a female knead it or bake it. The Syrian bread, called *xatha*, is made of the finest and purest flour, and is tempered with water, oil of olives, salt, and leaven. The preparation of it is carried on within the church by a priest or deacon. The bread used by the Greeks is peculiar. It is leavened, in form is round, with a square projection in the center, which is cut off with a lance prepared for the purpose. When the priest inserts the lance on the right side, he says, "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter;" on the left, "And as a blameless lamb dumb before his shearers, he opened not his mouth." In the upper part, he says, "In his humiliation his judgment was taken away;" in the lower, "And who shall declare his generation?" The deacon each time says, "Let us make our supplications to the Lord." (*Martène de Antiq. Eccl. Rit.*)

The most probable conclusion seems to be that the Lord's Supper was instituted at the paschal solemnities, and, consequently, the proper materials to be used in its celebration are those which were used at those solemnities, namely, *unleavened* bread and *wine*, not hermetically sealed inspissated grape juice, but *genuine wine* mingled with water. Whether the Supper was or was not instituted at the paschal feast will only affect the character of the bread to be used. The wine was that in common use, which had been tithed and was presentable to the

Lord of Israel. As Jesus did not institute merely *eating* and *drinking* as the memorial service, but *broke* the *bread* after he had *blessed it*, and gave to his disciples, saying, "*This* is my body," or a *memorial* of it, and took "the *cup of blessing*" (1 Cor. x, 16) and said, "*This* is my blood of the new testament," we ought to be exceedingly careful how we touch so sacred an institution, or tamper with the materials of which is built the monument of our Saviour's death; especially since he, in his last will and testament, gave such explicit directions for the perpetuation of his memory.

Art. VII. — THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The time has not come for a complete critical estimate of the work of the Revisers of the New Testament, which has so recently made its appearance. The labors of so many eminent Christian scholars for ten and a half years cannot be satisfactorily examined by any one in a few short months. The best that can at present be done by each individual in reviewing their work is to consider the general character of the revision, and to discuss such passages as he may have time and opportunity to examine. The scholarship of the Revisers is unquestioned, their integrity undoubted, and every inducement was before them to make this revision of the New Testament what it was expected to be, the representative of the best scholarship of the nineteenth century. No one will venture to charge them with want of fidelity or with unseemly haste.

It is proper, however, that their work should be subjected to a rigid criticism. The version which this is to succeed has been before the world for two hundred and seventy years; and it is no small proof of its general excellence that it has endured so long. It has deeply impressed itself on the language, literature, and life of all English-speaking people; its choicest passages have been chanted in music and recited in the ritual of the Church; it has been read in the hearing of the people with the most graceful elocution and with the most wonderful effect; the very form and the order of the words

have fallen on the ears like sweetest music; so that any change, however slight, jars upon them like some strange discord.

In our criticism of the Revised Version, then, it is not wise to lay too much stress on the rhythm of the Old Version, since the familiar language of that has formed the taste of the present generation. Its language in many places, no doubt, sounded very strangely to those who first heard it; and when years have made us familiar with the Revision it may be as hard to receive another version as it is now to receive this. Every change in a book so venerable and sacred must win its way by slow processes into the affections and confidence of the people.

The Revised Version comes to us with presumptions in its favor which cannot be lightly set aside.

1. It has long been conceded that a revision was needed.

2. This revision has been instituted by competent authority, and carried through by gentlemen of acknowledged scholarship and fidelity.

3. The work has not been confined to any denomination of Christians, but is the result of the united labors of evangelical Christendom, so far as our language is concerned.

4. It is to be presumed that where changes have been made reasons satisfactory to the committee must have been offered, such possibly as may escape the observation of the individual student, however scholarly.

These presumptions, however, should not free the work from candid criticism, since, however well the work is done, it is but another step in the march toward an absolutely perfect translation.

All that could properly be demanded of the revisers is that their work should represent the present state of biblical scholarship. It should be a work of truth, having no regard to sectarian opinions, neither inclined to orthodoxy nor heterodoxy. As pure scholars, their sole aim must be to give to the people the most accurate translation possible.

The main points demanding their attention may be comprised under five general heads. The translation should represent the present state of, 1, *Text-Criticism*; 2, *Grammatical Knowledge*; 3, *Lexicography*; 4, *Archæology*; 5, *The Idiom of the Language*.

Other matters of interest are mainly connected with these

The first, second, and fifth of these points will chiefly claim our attention in this paper.

I. *Changes originating in the criticism of the Greek text.*—While it was not the direct aim of the revisers to "construct a continuous and complete Greek text," yet it was necessary that they should substantially do so. At every step the first questions would be, "What did the evangelist or apostle actually write?" "Are these the exact words of the inspired penman?" Whenever a possible change of text would require a change of translation, it was absolutely essential that the text should be settled as exhaustively as it was possible to do it. This is the part of the work on which we think the greatest stress of the revisers should have been laid. The uncertainty of the text has been so constantly urged by objectors to the Christian religion, that we must be able to say that the text which is here translated is the nearest possible attainment to the autographs of the original writers. This is especially important inasmuch as but few of those who are to read the book are competent to pass judgment on it in this particular. Nor was it desirable that they should be. The number of great textual critics is not large, and this question must, therefore, be decided by the few rather than by the many. Nor is this statement any disparagement of the scholarship of those who have not made such studies a specialty. It only means that scholarship, in its highest forms, is not universal; that, for example, the most capable men in text-revision might not be the most valuable in translating, and *vice versa*.

This committee had, however, abundant material ready to their hand. The authorities had been most carefully collated, and were within the reach of all. The latest and best critics have left the results of their labors. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford had each lived long enough to finish editions of the Greek Testament, valuable not only because of the conclusions they reached, but especially for the digest of materials which accompany their texts. Thus, if any members of the committee were not professionals in this particular field, they had ample basis for judgment, and might have been a check on those who were in danger of extreme adherence to technical textual scholarship. In the judgment, therefore, of the whole body we have stronger assurances of a true Greek text than

we should have had in the decision of those alone who were chiefly professional text-critics.

We are, therefore, led to the conclusion that the text made by them, so far as it relates to the points on which different translations may arise, is the best now attainable; and, while we cannot agree with them in all their conclusions, we can readily accept their work in this regard as of the highest value.

The most advanced advocates of a *purely historical criticism* cannot complain of this text. Lachmann, who first attempted the formation of a text solely on ancient authorities, was not more rigid in his adherence to them than the revisers. In the rigid adherence to the rule that the evidence must be "decidedly preponderating," meaning thereby the documentary evidence, we think they have sometimes erred, but that they have insisted strongly on the most ancient authorities no one can question. On the wisdom of this we shall speak later.

Dr. Roberts, ("Companion to the Revised Version,") who was a member of the committee, gives the authorities chiefly relied upon, namely: A, or the Alexandrian MS., fifth century; B, or the Vatican MS., fourth century; C, or the Codex Ephraem, fifth century; D, or the Beza MS.; ℵ, or the Sinaitic MS., fourth century; of versions, Peshito Syriac, second century; Old Latin, third century; Gothic, fourth century; Coptic, third century; Armenian, fifth century; Ethiopic, sixth century. He also mentions Clement of Rome, first century; Justin Martyr and Irenæus, second century; Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen, third century. These are the chief witnesses on which they relied, and these must be the main sources of all true study of the New Testament text.

By observing the results of their labors we can readily see that they have been largely governed by these authorities, giving little weight to later manuscripts, and that they have almost entirely discarded subjective criticism.

Let us notice some of the improvements in which we think nearly all modern scholarship will agree. It was well that they rejected the passage concerning the angel who "troubled the water." John v, 4. The putting of this is true to fact. The marginal note saying, that "Many ancient authorities insert wholly or in part" this verse gives a fair statement of the evidence in the case, and while it asserts the preponderance to be

for its omission, there is no attempt to discredit the opinion of those who, like Lachmann, an authority little likely to err on the side of subjective testimony, retain it. They declare by their note that its retention is, in their view, a possible reading, which is all that any one would now venture to claim for it.

In Rom. viii, 1, the omission of "who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit," is in harmony with the best manuscript authority, and is adopted by the most eminent editors of the text. It is also demanded by the line of argument. In the revised text the verse now stands as a universal proposition, and gives great force to the apostle's reasoning. The introduction of the omitted portions can be so readily accounted for that the case seems a very clear one.

"The heavenly witnesses," 1 John v, 7, 8, are so transparently spurious that their omission caused no surprise on the part of those familiar with the facts, and these verses have long ceased to be appealed to in any doctrinal controversy. The most devoted advocate of the Trinity would not have appealed to this passage for a long while past, so that it is wrong to say, as some Unitarians have done, that the argument for this doctrine is impaired by this omission. This doctrine is so inwoven with the whole New Testament that the removal of no single passage can possibly affect it.

These are simply specimens of the good work the revisers have done in removing excrescences from the sacred text. There are some passages, however, on which we think their action has not been so wise. They have left some texts of great importance practically undecided, neither giving them a place as alternative readings nor placing them in the text, but putting them in an abnormal position as a part of the sacred narrative. A crucial case of this kind is Mark xvi, 9–20. We cannot but believe that the mode of its retention is unwise, and that, granting the conclusion at which they arrived, it would have been better to leave it as it was in our Authorized Version, and to accompany it with a marginal explanation. Its removal from close connection with verse 8 in a way to show that it is no part of Mark's Gospel, and yet its retention as gospel, though by another author, is a refinement difficult to comprehend by the ordinary reader, and calculated to mislead many pious but uncritical readers.

It is, we think, by no means proven that this is not a part of Mark's Gospel. A look at any of the critical discussions on this passage will not show such a preponderance of testimony against its genuineness as the committee's action would indicate.

A brief survey of the state of the evidence on this much-disputed passage will show that it might safely have been left as in the Authorized Version. Against it are the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts. The adverse testimony of the Vatican, however, is greatly impaired by the fact that a column is left vacant, as if there were something that needed to be inserted. One MS. of the Itala and two of the Æthiopic and the Armenian substantially omit it. Of the early Fathers, Eusebius is the only one now conceded to be against it. The statement of Dr. Roberts, ("Companion," p. 38,) quoted from Tregelles, that "Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, Victor of Antioch, Severus of Antioch, Jerome, as well as other writers, especially Greeks, testify that these verses were not written by St. Mark, or are not found in the best copies," does not properly present the case. Burgon, in his book on "The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to St. Mark," has shown that these writers quoted from Eusebius, and that, therefore, their independent testimony is worthless. (See "Hammond's Textual Criticism," p. 110.)

The internal evidence cited against it arises out of supposed contradictions, namely, that verse 9 disagrees with Matthew xxviii, 1; that verses 19 and 20 are in opposition to the Ascension on the fortieth day; that the style is manifestly not Mark's, since it contains a number of words and phrases not elsewhere used by him. Among the editors Tischendorf and Meyer omit it, while Tregelles, Alford, and Westcott and Hort insert it after a separation, or in brackets, showing doubts of its genuineness.

In its favor are almost all the great manuscripts, both uncial and cursive, including the Alexandrian and the Codex Ephraem of the uncials; 33, the "Queen of the Cursives;" and the Old Latin except k., Syriac, Memphitic, Gothic, and Georgian versions. Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Hippolytus approve its admission. The internal evidence is mainly in its favor. It is not likely that these statements, apparently contradictory to the others, would have been inserted

by any writer who was manufacturing an explanatory addition. The whole section is a unit, and necessary to the completion of the narrative. We cannot conceive of the Gospel of Mark closing with the eighth verse. This passage is defended by such critical scholars as Lachmann, Wordsworth, Ebrard, Lange, Scrivener. Scrivener closes his review of the evidence with these words: "All opposition to the authenticity of the paragraph resolves itself into the allegations of Eusebius and the testimony of ℵ B. Let us accord to them the weight which is their due; but against their verdict we can appeal to the reading of Irenæus and of both the elder Syriac translations in the second century, of nearly all other versions, and of all extant manuscripts excepting two." The argument against its being Mark's, because of its style, has been urged against too many writings acknowledged to be genuine, to afford proof for its rejection. Such being the testimony in this passage, we think the committee, in view of the conservative spirit in which they were pledged to act, would not only have been justified in leaving this passage untouched, but were required to do so. No sufficiently strong preponderating evidence to warrant a change is here apparent. In separating the passage from the rest of the Gospel they have, in fact, weakened its authority. We again assert that the truth would have been better served by a marginal explanatory note.

The story of the woman taken in adultery, in John vii, 53, to viii, 11, is differently treated. It is broadly distinguished from the rest, and placed in brackets. Dr. Roberts says that the "right conclusion probably is, that it is no part of St. John's Gospel, and yet is a perfectly true narrative which has descended to us from the apostolic age." The brackets, then, mean that it does not belong to John's Gospel, but is *a true narrative.* The conclusion that the passage is not a part of John's Gospel is not fully established when such scholars as Mill, Michaelis, Bengel, Ebrard, Stier, and others retain and defend it as genuine. Even Alford, with whose text the Revisers agree, says: "After all, the most weighty argument against the passage is found in its entire diversity from the style of narrative of our Evangelist." If this is the most weighty argument against it, both he and the Revisers might well have retained it in the text. The requirements of criticism would have been met by

leaving it, as in the authorized version, with an explanatory note stating that "many believe it to be a true narrative, but not a part of John's Gospel."

Romans v, 1, presents a case in which the value of internal evidence has been too entirely overlooked. The Authorized Version reads, "Therefore being justified by faith, *we have* (ἔχομεν) peace with God." The Revised Version reads, "Being therefore justified by faith, *let us have* (ἔχωμεν) peace with God."

It is at once admitted that the hortatory form has the support of the chief uncials, cursives, and versions; so that, if the decision were made solely on external evidence this is the undoubted reading of the text. Scrivener gives, in favor of the indicative, "ℵ^{a} B^{3} F G (in spite of the contrary testimony of f. g., their respective Latin versions,) P, the majority of the cursive manuscripts, Epiphanius, Cyril, and the Slavonic. The later Syriac seems to combine both readings."

We have in this an acknowledged case for the discussion of the admissibility of internal evidence. While we admit that its employment is exceedingly dangerous, it does not thereby follow that it is to be set aside altogether, and here seems a proper place for its use. Notwithstanding the weight of external evidence for the subjunctive, there is, nevertheless, sufficient authority in favor of the indicative to prevent a rash rejection of it.

In the first place, cursive manuscripts may, although later in date, represent earlier texts than the most ancient uncials. They may be copies of some that have passed away and of which we have no trace. In the next place, the manuscripts may be valuable for the notes of the corrector. While the corrector, in his attempt to make the meaning more clear, has often changed the text for the worse, it is nevertheless possible that his corrections may represent a removal of errors. With the acknowledged difficulty of copying any manuscript accurately, we may well pause before we give the sole importance always to the first hand.

In the text before us both ℵ B have ἔχομεν by the hands of correctors, and this fact, together with the very great difficulty of reconciling the subjunctive with the course of the argument, has led some of the most eminent critics to vary in their conclusions.

Alford, who reads ἔχωμεν, in his note shows the almost overpowering influence of internal evidence in favor of ἔχομεν, against which he struggled. His language is: "It is impossible to resist the strong manuscript authority for the reading ἔχωμεν in this verse. For, indeed, this may well be cited as the crucial instance of overpowering diplomatic authority compelling us to adopt a reading against which our subjective feelings rebel. Every internal consideration tends to impugn it."

How very near Alford came, however, to the retention of the indicative will appear by quoting from his "Prolegomena to the New Testament," where, after saying that the "consideration of the *context* is the very last that should be allowed by a critic to be present to his mind as an element of his judgment," he adds: "I do not say that in some extreme cases it may not have to be introduced, as perhaps (but I should now speak doubtfully even in this case) in Rom. v, 1, where there are so many confusing considerations arising from the habits of the manuscripts."

On the other hand, Meyer, in his "Critical Notes" on this passage, (Moore's Translation,) yields to the internal evidence, and retains the indicative. His capacity, both as a Greek scholar and critic, is beyond question, and his conclusion is that of one of the most independent inquirers. After quoting the authorities in favor of the subjunctive, he says: "But this reading, (the subjunctive,) though very strongly attested, yields a sense that is here utterly unsuitable; because the writer now enters a new and important *doctrinal topic*, and an exhortation at the very outset, especially regarding a subject not yet expressly spoken of, would at this stage be out of place."

It is somewhat remarkable that Tischendorf, over whom manuscript authority had such great influence as against internal evidence, favored the indicative until the finding of the Sinaitic manuscript. In his seventh edition we have ἔχομεν. Lachmann, too, who is the most uncompromising adherent to early evidence, hesitates to accept the subjunctive, and places ἔχωμεν in the margin. Westcott retains ἔχομεν as a marginal reading. We maintain, therefore, with Scrivener, that the *itacism*, ω for ο, so common in the early manuscripts, may at a very early period have led to the insertion of ω, and thus it became incorporated in many of the most ancient of

them; and that in this case the strong internal evidence must outweigh the preponderance of the external. We do not think the revisers have done justice to the Authorized reading or to its evidence in simply saying in the margin, "Some authorities read *we have*." We think they should have retained *we have*, and have said in the margin, "Strong manuscript authority supports *let us have*." The American Committee (see Appendix to the Revised Version) retain the indicative, with a marginal reading similar to the one we have indicated. As the American Committee was full as likely to make changes, where the evidence was "decidedly preponderating," as the English Committee, their conclusion goes to show that the insertion of the subjunctive in the text was not required by the evidence.

The rule of text criticism, *Proclivi lectioni præstat ardua*, is in danger of being overpressed. In the case before us the indicative is the easier and more natural reading, and while the above rule must be generally accepted, cases may arise in which, as in this one and the one immediately to follow, it is the wiser course to set it aside.

In 1 Timothy iii, 16, for the clause, "God was manifest in the flesh," the Revised Version reads, "He who was manifested in the flesh." The word θεος, *God*, in the Authorized Version again gives way to the testimony of manuscripts, and we have ὃς, translated *He who*, in its place. Even Scrivener, the most conservative of modern text-critics, surrenders the Authorized Version. If it were granted, as many believe, that the Alexandrian manuscript reads θεος, then the internal evidence, arising out of the strange grammatical structure which the introduction of ὃς gives to the Revised Version, would be a sufficient reason for retaining the text as it was and inserting a marginal note, stating that, "very strong manuscript authority reads, *who* instead of *God*. If, however, this be accepted, the relative being without any immediate antecedent, the implied one is God, and no such doctrinal change is wrought by the substitution of ὃς as some imagine.

The Revisers have introduced some changes not called for by their own rule, such as Mark xv, 45, where the new text inserts πτῶμα for σῶμα, and translates, "he granted the corpse to Joseph." Their rule is, that the question of text should only be raised when the translation would be affected by the

change. Certainly, while the new translation on this text more correctly renders the text which they have adopted, no important change in meaning is thereby made to the Authorized reading. It is better, however, to have the right text than the wrong one, and in this case they have done wisely in stretching to its utmost their own rule. Of the translation itself we shall speak hereafter.

These are some of the objections which, we think, might be justly raised to the Greek text, but they are so few in comparison with the great improvements which have been made in this regard, that we believe this text, as revised by the Committee, must now be received as the *Textus Receptus* for students of the Greek Testament. The Greek text, as accepted by the Revisers, has been published at Oxford, England, after notes made during the progress of revision by Rev. F. H. Scrivener, LL.D., under the editorial supervision of the Rev. Archdeacon Palmer, of Oxford, and is the only Greek text corresponding to the Revision of 1881 now accessible. It is to this text reference is made in this paper. All the other Greek Testament texts now before the public are the work of individual editors. This text must take a high rank, as the result of the joint labors of the best modern text-critics with the conclusions of these scholars before them.

II. *Changes arising out of conformity to the present state of grammatical knowledge.*

Like text-criticism, the advance in the knowledge of New Testament grammar has of late been very great. The great works of Winer, Buttmann, and Thomas Sheldon Green, have given an impulse to the study which must be felt in both the translation and the interpretation of the New Testament. The grammatical commentaries of Meyer and Ellicott have given a further impulse in the same direction. So far as the translation is concerned this advance has been most manifest in the case of the Greek article and of the tenses.

The accurate comprehension of the force of the Greek article is not easy, and many passages have been made obscure by the failure of the translator to understand its significance. No complete rules on the subject have yet been given, but it has been well observed that its insertion or omission has always a significance. Sometimes the article is omitted where at first view it would

most naturally appear necessary, as in the English phrase, "He has gone to town," meaning some particular town with which we are acquainted. Again, we say, "He has gone to the city," with a similar significance. These differences of expression may arise out of the rhythm of the sentence, or from use. Mr. Thomas Sheldon Green has most thoroughly grasped the idea of the article. His language is, "The article is prefixed to a word, or combination of words, when there is intended to be conveyed thereby, in the particular instance, an idea in some degree familiarized to the mind; it points to a previous familiarity, real or presumed." He regards the article as a sign of identification, and "closely and consequently, but not primarily, connected with definiteness." (Green's Grammar, pp. 6, 9.) This view throws light on many passages otherwise obscure, and shows the necessity for the proper translation of the article. We place the two translations of the first part of 1 Tim. i, 15 together. Authorized: "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation." Revised: "Faithful is the saying, and worthy of all acceptation." The article with "saying," "*the* saying," refers to that one "just recorded, touching the mercy and grace so singularly bestowed." The translators have here, by their literalness, added both to the force and to the dignity of the passage, and have given it a connection with the context not apparent in the Authorized Version.

The instances in which the sense has been greatly improved by the translation of the article are too numerous to be recited at length. The rendering of "the Christ" very frequently in the Gospels instead of Christ; "he looked for *the* city which hath foundations" instead of *a* city; *the* prophet instead of *that* prophet. These, among many instances, will occur even to the most cursory reader of the Revised Version. A good illustration is John iii, 10, "Art thou *the* teacher of Israel, [*i. e.*, the teacher well known,] and understandest not these things?" instead of the Authorized "Art thou *a master* of Israel, and knowest not these things?"

A text which in the Greek clearly shows the force of the article is Col. iii, 5, "Mortify therefore your members," etc. In the Authorized Version there is no article before any of the words, but in the Greek text the article is employed before the last noun, πλεονεξία. The article before this last noun marks

it as a "notorious immorality, especially to be avoided," which, in the Revised Version, is expressed by "*the* which is idolatry," but which would have been better brought out by "the covetousness which is idolatry." (Winer's Grammar, Thayer's Edition, p. 117.)

There are, however, some cases of the translation, or omission to translate the article, which are difficult to account for, and are quite important because of their exegetical significance.

With the word *νόμος*, in Romans and Galatians, the absence or presence of the article has much to do with the meaning, and their decision in regard to it cannot be received as final. The general rule in regard to *νόμος* is, that with the article it means the Mosaic law, and without it, law in general, although often inclusive of a reference to the Mosaic law. The revisers have manifestly appreciated the difficulty, as shown by their marginal notes.

Alford, Ellicott, Meyer, and Conybeare and Howson agree with the revisers, namely, the almost indifferent use of *νόμος* and *ὁ νόμος*, while Lightfoot, Thomas Sheldon Green, Middleton, Vaughan, and others recognize a broad distinction between the two. As the revisers have proposed the translation of the article with precision, a review of their work can only be seen by placing the text which they have translated and the Revision side by side, and then tracing the peculiarities of translation. The passages are selected from Romans and Galatians. The italics are our own, and are merely used to call attention to the point on which we make our comparison. The word appears with and without the article very frequently.

Rom. ii, 12–18; 23–27.

Ὅσοι γὰρ ἀνόμως ἥμαρτον, ἀνόμως καὶ ἀπολοῦνται· καὶ ὅσοι ἐν νόμῳ ἥμαρτον, διὰ νόμου κριθήσονται· οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ τοῦ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται· ὅταν γὰρ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτοῖς εἰσι νόμος· οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυνται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυρούσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως, καὶ μεταξὺ ἀλλήλων τῶν λογισμῶν κατηγορούντων ἢ καὶ ἀπολογουμένων, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὅτε κρινεῖ ὁ Θεὸς τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned *under law* shall be judged *by law*; for not the hearers *of a law* are just before God, but the doers *of a law* shall be justified: for when Gentiles which have no law do by nature the things of the law, these, having no law, are a law unto themselves; in that they shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith, and their thoughts one with another accusing or else excusing *them*; in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, according to my gospel, by Jesus Christ.

Εἰ δὲ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ἐπονομάζῃ, καὶ ἐπαναπαύῃ νόμῳ, καὶ καυχᾶσαι ἐν Θεῷ, καὶ γινώσκεις τὸ θέλημα, καὶ δοκιμάζεις τὰ διαφέροντα, κατηχούμενος ἐκ τοῦ νόμου.

But if thou bearest the name of a Jew, and restest upon *the law*, [marg. *a law*,] and gloriest in God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are excellent, being instructed out of the law.

Τὸν ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶσαι, διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τὸν Θεὸν ἀτιμάζεις; τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι, καθὼς γέγραπται. περιτομὴ μὲν γὰρ ὠφελεῖ, ἐὰν νόμον πράσσῃς· ἐὰν δὲ παραβατὴς νόμου ᾖς, ἡ περιτομή σου ἀκροβυστία γέγονεν. ἐὰν οὖν ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου φυλάσσῃ, οὐχὶ ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ εἰς περιτομὴν λογισθήσεται, καὶ κρινεῖ ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα σὲ τὸν διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην νόμου;

Thou who gloriest in *the law*, through thy transgression of *the law* dishonourest thou God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you, even as it is written. For circumcision indeed profiteth, if thou be a doer of *the law:* but if thou be a transgressor of *the law*, thy circumcision is become uncircumcision. If therefore the uncircumcision keep the ordinances of *the law*, shall not his uncircumcision be reckoned for circumcision? and shall not the uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfill *the law*, judge thee, who with the letter and circumcision art a transgressor of *the law?*

Rom. iii, 19–21.

Οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ὅσα ὁ νόμος λέγει, τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαλεῖ, ἵνα πᾶν στόμα φραγῇ, καὶ ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ Θεῷ· διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας. νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν.

Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it speaketh to them that are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may be brought under the judgement of God: because by the works of *the law* shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by *the law cometh* the knowledge of sin. But now apart from *the law* a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by *the law* and the prophets.

Gal. iii, 18.

Εἰ γὰρ ἐκ νόμου ἡ κληρονομία, οὐκέτι ἐξ ἐπαγγελίας.

For if the inheritance is of *the law*, it is no more of promise.

Gal. iv, 4, 5.

Ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον, ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ, ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν.

God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under *the law*, that he might redeem them which were under *the law*, that we might receive the adoption of sons.

Gal. iv, 21.

Λέγετέ μοι, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε;

Tell me, ye that desire to be under *the law*, do ye not hear *the law?*

Gal. vi, 13.

Οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι αὐτοὶ νόμον φυλάσσουσιν·

For not even they who receive circumcision do themselves keep *the law*;

The above passages afford ample scope to study the translation of the article in relation to the word law. Our attention is first arrested by the apparent desire of the revisers to translate the article in accordance with the Greek. In Rom. ii, 12, the word *νόμος* is in the Greek, in every case, without the article, and it is translated accordingly, wherever

our Authorized Version reads *the* law. In verse 13 the first word *law* in the Greek wants the article, and the second has the article. Yet the revisers translate both words without the article. The omission of the article in the last clause of that verse, when it is preserved in their own Greek text, seems unaccountable. It is possible that the retention of the second article in the Greek text is an error. The American Committee read "*the* law" for "*a* law" in this verse. In the 17th verse there is no article in the text, but they have inserted it, though with a marginal note omitting it. In the 25th verse it is translated *the* law, although the article is not in the text. The last word of verse 27 is without the article, though it is written *the* law in the Revision.

Rom. iii, 20, is a very important passage, rendering its accurate translation worthy of careful study. The Revision inserts the article in both cases before *law*, whereas no article is found in the Greek. Rom. iii, 21: the first *law* is without article and the last has it, though both are translated *the law*.

All the passages cited from Galatians are translated as if they had the article. In Gal. iv, 21, we find that the translators refuse to recognize any distinction between *law* and *the law*, translating both as if having the article.

This seems to be an anomaly in translation as compared with their own rule of uniformity. It appears reasonable that here as elsewhere the words ought to have been translated uniformly, as in the Greek text, with a marginal explanation stating the general facts of the case.

It does not seem supposable that so careful a writer as Paul would in such a succession of instances use such an important word so indiscriminately. We can hardly imagine that hearers of *a law* and doers of *a law* should be represented, the former without the article and the latter with it. It is hard to believe that νόμῳ and τῷ νόμῳ mean exactly the same thing. If such be the case, would it not be better, as a matter of translation, to give the word after the Greek original in every case, and leave the meaning to be decided by the reader rather than by the translator? The omission or insertion of the article, as done by the revisers in this case, cannot carry with it full conviction, however plausible the exegetical reasons may be which seem to require it.

Justice to the Revision requires the statement that the use of *νόμος*, especially in Romans and Galatians, is a vexed question with grammarians and commentators, but the final result, we think, must uphold the apostle's discriminations.

Green (" Grammar of New Testament," p. 80) remarks:

Whenever the word *νόμος*, in the New Testament, has the article prefixed without reference to the context, the term must then be used to signify the Mosaic law. At the same time this is a case in which, as the effect of familiar currency, the article might drop away, and the anarthrous term itself come to have a conventional meaning, and pass, as it were, into a proper noun. Whether, however, this license is to be recognized in the language of St. Paul is a point well worthy of consideration, and not to be disregarded, because such usage is possible. . . . There are certain places where, though the word is anarthrous, the Mosaic law, and that alone, evidently was present to the mind of the writer; but still an effect of the absence of the article is clearly discernible, namely, a greater prominence of the internal force of the word, a suggesting of the attributes of law rather than the law; and, besides this, by means of the unrestricted term the proposition is given with a broader and more imposing cast. . . . It is reasonable, then, whenever in the Epistles of St. Paul the term *νόμος* is anarthrous, though the Mosaic law must have been present to the mind of the writer, to recognize a resulting effect, such as has been here exemplified in particular instances, and to attribute it to design.

It seems clear, in harmony with the main thought of this accurate scholar, that there was in the mind of Paul a distinction, resulting from the absence of the article, which is obliterated by its insertion in English. In conformity with this view he translates Gal. ii, 19, "For I through *law* died to *law*," omitting the article which the revisers insert in the text, though they also omit it in the margin.

He makes similar remarks on the distinction as shown in Gal. ii, 16, 21; iii, 18; and Rom. iii, 28. In these cases the revisers insert the article, irrespective of its absence in most of them in the original.

The translation of the tenses has been greatly improved in the Revision. It is surprising how little discrimination was made in our Authorized Version, especially between the aorist and the perfect. The aorist is also frequently translated as present, greatly to the confusion of the sense. There is a clearer view of the change which arises out of the more exact

rendering of this tense than is given in Rom. vi, 1–11. The Revisers most accurately render this great passage, and thus throw new and beautiful light upon it. We give their translation entire:

What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. We who died to sin, how shall we any longer live therein? Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united with *him* by the likeness of his death, we shall be also *by the likeness* of his resurrection; knowing this, that our old man was crucified with *him*, that the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in bondage to sin; for he that hath died is justified from sin. But if we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him; knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death no more hath dominion over him. For the death that he died, he died unto sin once: but the life that he liveth, he liveth unto God.

Here they have translated every verb in its true aoristic sense, whereas the Authorized Version employs the present. Whether the aorist should ever be translated as a present is a question still undecided, although evidently the translators have regarded it as possible, and have acted accordingly.

Some of these variations of translation of this tense, however, are somewhat remarkable, and are legitimate subjects of criticism. They are, in some instances, of great significance, and cannot be lightly passed over. The aorist *ἥμαρτον* is translated *sinned* in Rom. v, 12, whereas in Rom. ii, 12, and iii, 23, the same word is translated *have sinned*. The use of this aorist for the perfect is denied by Winer, the most eminent of New Testament grammarians, and while it is allowed by Buttmann, is not established with certainty. There are some cases in which, when the term is definitely fixed by the circumstances or context, tenses in all languages are used somewhat indifferently to give variety or force to the expression. In such cases no special complications can arise, and no criticism is called for. The case of Rom. v, 12, is more important. The Authorized Version reads, "Death passed upon all men, for that all *have sinned*." The Revised Version reads,

"Death passed unto all men, for that *all sinned*." This passage is so similar, both in construction and thought, to Rom. iii, 22, that it is a matter of surprise that the same term and word should in one case be translated *have sinned*, and in the other *sinned*. Dr. Whedon (Commentary on Romans) on this passage gives, with great force and clearness, an aoristic sense to it, which is recognized both in classical and in New Testament usage, namely, that in both cases it is a gnomic aorist. His language is: "The aorist or past tense, here used of the word *sinned*, does in this epistle often imply a general certain fact or state of facts. So it is used in Rom. iii, 23; ix, 22, 23; viii, 29, 30." This force of the aorist is recognized by the revisers in their translation of 1 Pet. i, 25, "The grass withereth, and the flower falleth," where both verbs in the original are in the aorist tense.

Inasmuch as the *gnomic* is an established Greek usage, and the aorist for the perfect is questioned by many grammarians, the better way for the revisers would have been to have translated the aorist with uniform strictness, or to have left the Authorized Version unchanged in this respect. The American Committee suggest the marginal reading *sinned* in Rom. ii, 12, and iii, 23.

III. *Changes arising out of the present state of the English language and of the more exact knowledge of the meaning of the original.*

In this may properly be included both archæology and lexicography. These subjects are so broad that we can do little more than refer to them.

With regard to the removal of archaisms they have done well, and have ceased at the proper point. In this regard the conservatism of the committee has rendered good service in retaining all the old words which involve no misapprehension of the sense. The quaintness of the style is one of the great beauties of the Old Version, and it should only be removed when necessary to make clear the meaning.

It would be a superfluous task to notice the many improvements in translation and in punctuation. Mark ix, 22, 23 is a case in point: "And oft-times it hath cast him both into the fire and into the waters, to destroy him: but if thou canst do any thing, have compassion on us, and help us. And Jesus

said unto him, If thou canst! All things are possible to him that believeth."

Again, how richly they have brought out the meaning of 2 Cor. ii, 14. The Authorized Version reads, "Now thanks be unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ." The Revised reads, "But thanks be unto God, which always leadeth us in triumph in Christ." It is the thanks of the great apostle to Christ, who has subjected him, that is here brought into view. In many, very many passages, the Revised Version will form a most valuable commentary.

There are some changes, however, the reasons for which are not so apparent. In Heb. i, 1, the Revision reads, "God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners." The changed meanings of the words Πολυμερος καὶ Πολυτρόπως, by *divers portions and in divers manners*, are strictly accurate, but the change of the order of the words, placing them out of the position they occupy in the Greek, is neither fortified by Greek usage nor by the antithesis required in the sense. There seems to be a double antithesis, but the chief one, which is that between the *divers portions and divers manners* of the old revelation and the singleness of the revelation in Christ, is obscured by the change. The Geneva, the Rheims, and the Authorized all agree in placing these words among the earliest in the sentence, and none of the versions make such a transfer of them as is found in this Revision.

A very remarkable case of explanatory translation is found in 2 Tim. ii, 26: *καὶ ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος ἐζωγρημένοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα.* The Authorized Version reads, "And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will." The Revision has it, "And they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, having been taken captive by the Lord's servant unto the will of God." "The Lord's servant" is not in the Greek at all, nor is the word "God" in the Greek, as is admitted in the margin. This is not, therefore, a revised translation, but a paraphrase, which, whether correct or not, should have no place in an attempt at literal translation. The Authorized Version is more exact as a representation of the Greek, and should have been retained.

In James i, 17, "Neither *shadow of turning*," in the Revised reads, "Neither shadow that is cast by turning." The Greek of which this is a translation is, τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα. It is, literally, *shadow of turning*. The exact nature of the genitive here may be a question; but in making it a subjective genitive, and expounding it to mean *cast by turning*, they have gone beyond the sphere of translators. The same remark is applicable to the clause in the Lord's Prayer, "Deliver us from the evil *one*." They have inserted *one* without authorization, and, irrespective of what it means, its insertion was unnecessary. Also, in Hebrews iii, 2, 5, and 6, in which the words *his house* occur, they have in each case placed in the margin an explanatory note saying, "that is, *God's house*." The only explanations called for in the margin were such as were necessary to explain the translation.

The matter of punctuation is very important, and because of the absence of marks of punctuation in the most ancient manuscripts, required great care on the part of the revisers. An instance in point, showing the difficulty, is found in Rom. ix, 5. Our Authorized Translation reads: "Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen."

The Revision reads: "Whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, [4]who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen." To which the revisers add in the margin: "[4]Some modern interpreters place a full stop after *flesh*, and translate, *He who is God over all be* (*is*) *blessed forever*: or, *He who is over all is God, blessed forever*. Others punctuate, *flesh, who is over all. God be* (*is*) *blessed forever*." It will at once appear how delicate and difficult is the work of translation when so many ways of punctuation are possible. They have wisely adhered to the old method, and have very good grounds for their preference. This part of the revisers' work has been done with great care, and will be found to throw much light upon the sacred page. The absence of punctuation marks in the most ancient manuscripts makes this part of the work of revision partake of the nature of a commentary; but this is unavoidable, and the concurrent judgment of so many scholars as to what the punctuation ought to be carries with it great weight.

A point on which the revisers have insisted with much emphasis, is uniformity of translation, that is, the employment of the same English word for the same Greek word, whenever it is exegetically possible to do so. The principle is a good one, and has cleared up many passages to the ordinary reader. That this should be the case with all words where no essential difference in meaning would arise, seems highly proper. It is a rule, however, which requires great care and skill in its exercise. We are scarcely aware how frequently, even in English, we use the same word in close contextual connection, with different shades of meaning which are at once apparent to the reader. The same is true in Greek, and in such cases the skill of the translator is taxed to the utmost. A word that in itself has a distinct meaning has an entirely different meaning in its relations to an entire sentence. This is often seen in the difference between the word given in a translation and the same word as employed in the same commentary. Bishop Ellicott, the Chairman of the English Committee of the New Testament Revision, makes the following remarks in regard to the translations in connection with some of his own commentaries. His language is, (Preface to Philippians, page ix:)

I have more than once had my attention called to passages in former commentaries, where the translation in the notes has not appeared in perfect unison with that in the Revised Version. [His own translation accompanying his Commentary.] In most instances these seeming discrepancies have arisen from the fact that the fixed principles on which I venture to revise the Authorized Version do not always admit of exact identity of language in the version and in the note. In a word, the translation in the note presents what has been considered the most exact rendering of the words taken *per se;* the Revised Version preserves that rendering as far as is compatible with the *lex operis*, the context, the idioms of our language, or, lastly, that grace and archaic tone of our admirable version which, even in a revised form of it, designed only *for the closet*, it seemed a kind of sacrilege to displace for the possibly more precise, yet often really less expressive, phraseology of modern diction. Needlessly to divorce the original and that version with which our ears are so familiar, and often our highest associations and purest sympathies so intimately bound, is an ill-considered course, which, more than any thing else, may tend to foster an unyoked spirit of scriptural study and translation, alike unfilial and presumptuous, and to which a modern reviser may hereafter bitterly repent to have lent his example or his contributions.

This language of this distinguished scholar has in it the spirit of the true translator.

The Revisers' doctrine of *consequence*, however, that is, changes in translation, arising out of some former alteration, may easily be carried too far, and in some cases has injured rather than helped the sense.

There are instances in which they have not made the translation of the same word uniform, even when no confusion could arise out of such uniformity. In Mark xv, 45, they have, in accordance with the best manuscript authority, changed σῶμα to πτῶμα, and translated the latter by the English word *corpse*. This translation occurs with Matt. xiv, 12, and Mark vi, 29. In Matt. xxiv, 28, the same word is translated *carcase*, and in Rev. xi, 8, *dead bodies*, with the word *carcase* in the margin. The Greek word in each case is the same. The Revisers' distinction is between the human body, which they translate *corpse*, and the body of an animal, which they call both *dead body* and *carcase*. Would it not have been as well to give one name for all, and thus have complete uniformity, namely, in every case translate πτῶμα by *dead body?*

That this doctrine of *consequence* may easily lead astray is seen in Matt. xvi, 26, "For what shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and forfeit his life? or what shall a man give in exchange for his life?" The margin for life reads *soul*. The meaning of that passage in the Revision is quite different from the impression made upon us by the Authorized Version: "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" ψυχή, according to the translation, is to be *soul*, but, as Alford says, "life in the highest sense." Yet they allow a marginal reading, *soul*. Also they had previously translated the same word by *soul*. In Matt. x, 28, the Revised translation retains the word *soul* for ψυχή. It reads: "And be not afraid of them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." The comparison of this verse with Matt. xvi, 26, shows that in the latter case, in order to preserve a uniform translation of the same word, they have adopted a reading which weakens the force of the passage, confining to a part of earthly life that which we believe to refer to the spiritual and

immortal nature. The loss of our merely earthly life is not treated of in Scripture as a great calamity. In both of these cases there is no gain, either in sense or force, in the changes made in the Revision.

The subject of prepositions is extremely important, and has been handled by the revisers with much care. They have, however, contrary to their own doctrine of *consequence*, made some unnecessary changes in the rendering of the same word. The preposition ὑπέρ is one of frequent use, especially by the Apostle Paul. We do not raise the question of the meaning of the word, but of the uniformity of translation. Whether in Pauline usage it is equivalent to ἀντι is not pertinent to our present inquiry. ὑπέρ is employed in Paul's Epistles over one hundred times, while ἀντι is used but seven times. In the Gospels, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, it is in almost every case translated *for;* whereas in Phil. i, 4, 7, 29; Col. i, 7; and many places in 2 Corinthians, the same word is translated *in behalf of*. Why *for* is employed in Romans, Galatians and 1 Corinthians, and *in behalf of* in 2 Corinthians and Philippians, does not appear. *For* is susceptible of two meanings, and may, therefore, properly represent the uncertainty in the minds of many in regard to its exact force in some passages of great doctrinal significance. But why change from *for* to *in behalf of* in cases where no interest either of translation or of exegesis seems to require it? Here the doctrine of *consequence* is apparently violated without any reason for it. This seems to be the case where the rule, the "same word for the same thing," except in cases of decided exegetical necessity, would appear to be strictly in order and has been unnecessarily violated. That the word *for* as equivalent to ὑπὲρ in Romans is not out of order in Philippians, is shown by the translation of so scholarly a man as Bishop Ellicott, above referred to, a member of the English Committee. He translates ὑπὲρ *for* in Phil. i, 4, whereas in verse 19 he adheres to the Authorized *in behalf of*.

In their translation they should have put the more pronounced Hebraisms in modern English, that is, in every case where the sense is affected thereby. A more idiomatic English rendering of Luke xxii, 15, might have increased its force to the English reader, "And he said unto them, *With desire I have desired* to eat this passover with you before I suffer."

The phrase, *with desire I have desired*, is a translation of ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα, a recognized Hebraism, corresponding to the infinitive absolute joined to the finite verb, as מות תמות. (Septuagint, θανάτῳ ἀποθανεισθε,) *to die, thou shalt die*, or *thou shalt surely die*, in Gen. ii, 17. The sense of this verse in Luke is, "*I earnestly desired* to eat this passover with you before I suffer," a meaning which is not at first apparent to the reader of either the Authorized or the Revised Version.

These are some considerations in regard to this great work which have been suggested by a general perusal of parts of its contents. As we have looked at it more and more the conviction has gained in force that this is a great advance in the accurate presentation of the meaning of the original, and that in many cases, as already suggested, where no reason for the change appears to us, some reason must have appeared to those to whom the work was intrusted.

The reverent student of the Bible will not trouble himself too much with the effect this Revision will have on the current theological doctrines. Of one thing we are well assured: no vital doctrine has been affected to its injury by this work. The Trinity, the divinity of Christ, the atonement, regeneration and sanctification by faith, the eternity of rewards and punishments, stand out none the less clearly in the Revision of 1881 than in that of 1611. In any case, whatever theology is contained in the Bible must be accepted; whatever cannot be maintained and proved out of the holy Scriptures is not necessary to salvation.

In the case of the New Testament the wise men have once again brought their treasures and laid them at the feet of Christ in reverent homage to him as King of kings and Lord of lords; and in translating to men the revelation of his life and teachings they have won for themselves the heartiest thanks of the generations that are to come. Honored, thrice honored, are these Christian scholars, who have thus been permitted to share the toil of opening to the millions of the English-speaking world the rich treasures of divine wisdom.

Art. VIII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Reviews.

Bibliotheca Sacra, July, 1881. (Andover.)—1. Old Catholicism; by Rev. Frank H. Foster. 2. The Know-Nothing Position in Religion; by Prof. James T. Bixby. 3. Does the New Testament Warrant the Hope of a Probation Beyond the Grave? by Prof. R. D. C. Robbins. 4. Exegesis of Matthew i. 1; by Rev. Charles C. Starbuck. 5. A Christian Sabbath in the New Dispensation: Biblical and Patristical Evidence; by Rev. William De Loss Love, D.D. 6. The New Testament Revision; by Rev. Frederic Gardiner, D.D. 7. Polyglot Bibles in the "John Carter Brown Library;" by Rev. J. C. Stockbridge, D.D.

New Englander, July, 1881. (New Haven.)—1. The Thoughts of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius; by Prof. R. B. Richardson. 2. The Authority of Faith; by Rev. Geo. B. Stevens. 3. Concerning Sacred Music, Ancient and Modern; by Rev. G. H. Griffin. 4. The Philosophy of Value; by Prof. J. B. Clark. 5. The Indo-European Family—its Subdivisions; by Prof. J. H. Wright. 6. More Light upon Maryland Toleration; by President Magoun. 7. The Progress of Liberty of Conscience in Christendom; by Rev. E. Woodward Brown. 8. The Constitution of Yale College; by Rev. Leonard Bacon, D.D.

September.—1. Professor David Paige Smith, M.D.: a Memorial Discourse; by President Porter. 2. The Minority in the Mother Country, 1774; by Rev. T. Harwood Pattison, D.D. 3. Moses and his Wife; by Rev. Moses C. Welch. 4. Old and New Calvinism; by Rev. John M. Williams. 5. Our National Name: What Does it Mean? by Charles H. J. Douglass. 6. College and University: President Carter's Inaugural Address; by Rev. Edward B. Coe, D.D. 7. Does Psyche "fly out of the Window?" by Rev. S. B. Goodenow. 8. Psychical Mechanics: Address of Dr. Gustave Glogau, of University of Zurich, Switzerland; translated by Rev. John B. Chase.

Princeton Review, July, 1881. (New York.)—1. Continental and Island Life; by John W. Dawson, LL.D. 2. English Poetry in the Eighteenth Century; by Principal John D. Shairp, D.C.L. 3. The Historical Proofs of Christianity; by Prof. George P. Fisher, D.D., LL.D. 4. Philosophical Results of a Denial of Miracles; by President John Bascom. 5. Late American Statesmen; by Francis Wharton, D.D., LL.D. 6. Anthropomorphism; by M. Stuart Phelps, Ph.D.

September.—1. Assassination and the Spoils System; by Dorman B. Eaton, Esq. 2. The Prospective Civilization of Africa; by Canon George Rawlinson. 3. The Subjective Theory of Inspiration; by Prof. Charles Elliott, D.D. 4. Our Public Debts; by Robert P. Porter, Esq. 5. The Historical Proofs of Christianity; by George P. Fisher, D.D., LL.D. 6. On Certain Abuses in Language; by Edward A. Freeman, D.C.L.

Presbyterian Review, July, 1881. (New York.)—1. The Plan of the New Bible Revision; by the Rev. Talbot W. Chambers, D.D. 2. Henry Boynton Smith; by Prof. Zephaniah M. Humphrey, D.D. 3. The Grounds and Methods of the Temperance Reform; by Prof. John W. Mears, D.D. 4. The Ethical Element in our Earlier Literature; by Prof. Theodore W. Hunt, Ph.D. 5. Critical Theories of the Sacred Scriptures in Relation to their Inspiration; by Prof. Charles A. Briggs, D.D. 6. Notes and Notices.

"The Presbyterian Review," conducted by Dr. A. A. Hodge and Charles A. Briggs as chief editors, with five learned gentlemen as associates, comes to us freighted with the learning and ability which we should expect from the great denomination it

represents. It is not the name of Hodge alone that impressively reminds us of the "Princeton" as it once was.

The article on the *New Bible Revision*, by Dr. Chambers, one of the revisers, expresses a favorable judgment of the work:

> The deviations from the *textus receptus* are very many, averaging in the gospels five in every eight verses, (although of course many of these are very slight,) while in the Acts one of the revisers says there are sixteen hundred, the most of which, however, do not appear in the Revision. The work, then, may be fairly considered as exhibiting a faithful application of the principles of biblical criticism: and the result shown in its pages proves afresh the ignorance and the stupidity of the clamor which enemies of the truth have made about the various readings, as if they impeached the authority of the sacred text. . . . The book is more intelligible to the unlearned reader, and yet preserves the antique flavor which so well befits its age and character. Of course there are many who will object to the continued use of *which* to denote persons, and *be* in the sense of "are," but this, after all, is a matter of taste, since the archaisms do not mislead any body, and children do not read the Bible in order to learn modern grammar. On the other hand, some have denounced the changes which have been made as "frivolous and capricious." It is certain that this charge cannot be sustained. Caprice has had no hand in any thing that has been done. The character of the revisers is sufficient evidence of this. They had a reason for whatever they inserted or omitted. The reason may have been insufficient, but in their view it was well grounded and adequate. —Pp. 471, 473.

Eight pages of fine print are devoted to a survey of the doings of the Presbyterian General Assembly, 1881, written by Dr. A. A. Hodge. We note the two topics *Vacant Churches and Unemployed Ministers* and *Temperance*.

The deplorable facts as to failure of our Church, as at present administered, to distribute advantageously the ministerial force at her disposal, is clearly exhibited by the committee in the following table:

States.	Ministers.	Without charge.	Vacant churches
New York	998	63	89
New Jersey	365	15	26
Pennsylvania	858	82	165
Ohio	504	32	106
Indiana	185	15	84
Illinois	401	42	135
Missouri	130	19	52
Kansas	181	20	43
Colorado	37	6	12
Utah	12	0	0
California	122	7	40

This condition they attribute to three causes: (1) Want of adequate support for the ministry; (2) A lack of consecration on the part of the ministry to its work; (3) A want of system in bringing those who are willing and able to work and the vacant Churches together.—P. 584.

A plan was formed for remedying this evil by organic action.

On the subject of *temperance* there was appointed a permanent committee, with its center at New York, consisting of seven ministers and seven elders. Some objection was raised against this movement, as forming a precedent for "an endless series of other reformatory agencies." But the Assembly wisely viewed intemperance as such a specialty as to relieve this organization from being a precedent. We then have the following two paragraphs, for which Dr. H. seems to be personal sponsor:

The great danger lies in the practical matter of the use of real wine (that is, fermented juice of the grape) at the Lord's Supper. This Assembly decided that its predecessors "had always recognized the right of each Church Session to decide what is bread and what is wine." This appears to be an extreme concession, in view of the fact that the traditions of the fathers, the *concensus* of the Churches, the history of the past, the scholarship of the present, the testimony of travelers and missionaries, stand as one unbroken wall in testimony to the fact that to become WINE it is necessary that the juice of the grape should be fermented. This is so true that any real or apparent testimony to the contrary is received only as a puzzle of eccentricity or of accident.

Yet there need be no danger until the use of unfermented fruit-juice is erected into a *moral* principle. If a man who knows that Christ used the fermented juice of the grape in the institution of the Last Supper, to symbolize his atoning blood, yet declares that it is immoral for us to do so, he is evidently guilty of an unsurpassed blasphemy. But the great mass of competent scholars know that Christ did so. Those brethren, therefore, who press this question as a *moral* one threaten not only to oppress the consciences of their brethren, but to introduce an occasion of schism far deeper and broader than any mere difference of doctrine or Church government, or of sacramental mode or virtue. As for the rest, if this question of BIBLE WINES were once settled we ought to be all one. Every Christian must be a sincere temperance man, and in this age the great mass of us are ready, in all social relations, to advocate the practice of total abstinence on the ground of Christian expediency, which of course carries with the obligation of Christian duty.—P. 586.

All that seems to us extremely perpendicular and positive phraseology. If Dr. Hodge *knows* that "competent scholars

know that Christ used the fermented juice of the grape in the institution of the Lord's Supper," that of course settles the question; but Dr. Hodge scarcely knows that "competent scholars know" so; and that they "know" so is, mayhap, not a fact. Says "M'Clintock & Strong's Cyclopedia," noticed on another page, "There is no positive proof that the fluid used by our Lord in instituting the sacred communion was alcoholic." Now, if there is "no positive proof," there can be no positive knowledge, and even competent scholars cannot "know" it. We doubt not that an intense repugnance to the use of a dishonest exegesis to attain a reformatory end lies at the bottom of these very positive assertions of questionable opinions. And surely the attainment of an ethical end by an unethical process is to be most peremptorily rejected. Yet the overstrained fear of such a dishonesty may destroy the mental balance, and lead to as fearful a moral disaster on the other side. We think these venerated men ought to feel some misgivings, ought to deal in gentler statements, when they find themselves intensely maintaining the absolute duty of *poison in the communion cup.* So startling a position should give pause, and leave a most serious query whether their reasonings are not terribly invalidated by their results—amounting to very near a *reductio ad absurdum.* And we may further hint that any assumption to read out of the guild of scholarship any questioner of these assertions will be no success.

American Catholic Quarterly Review, July, 1881. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Soul and Evolution; by St. George Mivart, F.R.S., etc. 2. Catholic Colonization in the West; by William J. Onahan. 3. Richard Crashaw; by Joseph A. Nolan, M.D., Ph.D. 4. The Latest of the Revisions; by Very Rev. James A. Corcoran, D.D. 5. The Irish Land Bill; by M. F. Sullivan. 6. What Has the Federal Government to Mismanage the Indians; by John Gilmary Shea, LL.D. 7. Biology; or, The Principle of Life; by Rev. Thos. Hughes, S. J.

The article on Catholic Colonization in the West indicates a new departure for the Catholic immigrants into our country. While other races and religious denominations pass our great cities and lay their proprietorship upon the large landed areas of our West, the Irish Catholics fill the tenement houses of New York. They are the victims of the saloon and the caucus; they become impoverished and demoralized, and stand as the most terrible indictment against Catholicism in the whole field of controversy. The whole country views them as "the

slums" of the city and dregs of the country, and exclaim, "And this, forsooth, is the Holy Catholic Church!" While this sad repute of her immigrants remains Catholicism will find that her immigration is her only source of increase. It is at a terrible cost that she plays subservient to our lowest demagogism and purloins money from our public funds, through the fingers of our party "Bosses," to build cathedrals. No conversions from Protestantism can take place; and when the foreign fountain is exhausted the stream is dry and the lake to which it flowed becomes stagnant and putrid.

But let her spread her Ireland in the broad West, and industry, republicanism, and piety may make them a beauty and a power. We have no fear of them. Time and events can mutate the immutable and correct the infallible. The pastorate of the Pope will first become solely spiritual and then nominal. The inducements to maintain transubstantiation and priestly substitution will cease. And then there will be a splendid residue of truth, history, and piety in Catholicism which we all can admire and love when her present over-lofty claims shall be duly lowered. At present she is still *Roman* Catholic; when she drops her Roman traits and becomes purely Catholic she will form a concordant *part* of what is truly the Catholic Church of Christ.

The article on THE LATEST OF THE REVISIONS, by the learned and able editor, Dr. Corcoran, is rather preparatory to a second article, and so is a survey of the past revisions. That survey, we are sorry to say, is written in the bitterest style of old partisanships, suited by him to his own audience, but little fitted to stand the criticism of a broader and less partisan public. Not that the charges of partisan translating of the Bible are in all cases untenable, especially in the case of Beza. But, with the learned Doctor, all on the Protestant side is black, and all on the other side seems spotless white. He well knows what criticisms can be passed upon the Rhemish version, both text and notes. And his candid acknowledgments of the excellence of the latest revision admit that as the mists of partisanship are dispersed Protestantism rejoices in the attainment of purer truth. Would that we could say the same of Romanism! Very soon then might Romanism disappear, and Catholicism be the noble remainder.

Omitting the extended remarks upon the early English versions, much of which is good only for its intended audience, we quote the following *statement* of the *three steps* by which Protestantism secured its independence of the domination of Rome:

> First, they began by clamoring for toleration, or what would now be called religious liberty. When, by fair means or foul, they had secured this, their next cry was for religious supremacy. Successful in this, as they were too often, by tumult, rebellion, and crime, the third effort was to procure the extermination of the adherents of the old creed. This third step was common to all countries, whether the Reformation had grown upward from the people or downward from the throne.—P. 483.

Leaving out the opprobrious phrases here as elsewhere interpolated through nearly the whole article, Dr. Corcoran's *three steps* may thus be restated: First, the Romanists denied the Protestants' right to their own religious opinions, and claimed the right, and exercised it, to crush it out by force and bloodshed; while the Protestants asserted the rights of religious liberty and maintained them in battle. Thus far the Romanists were cruel despots and the Protestants the asserters of the rights of man. Second, the Protestants aimed at "supremacy;" that is, they found they could secure their religious freedom against their assailants only by conquering them and compelling them to keep the peace. We submit they were and are right in both these steps, and the Romanists wrong. Third, they aimed at the "extermination" of those who purposed to exterminate them. Protestants have rightly destroyed their inveterate destroyers. Nevertheless, that in this great contest of three centuries for religious freedom the Protestants have never overstepped their own principles and become assailants unnecessarily, need not be affirmed. But the great whole of the history is that Romanism has permanently aimed to crush out religious freedom and Protestantism to maintain it. Hence, when Dr. Corcoran scatters through his learned "Quarterly" his complaints of the "persecution of Catholics," we may remind him that such utterance will only do for his own limited audience; to all outsiders it reads like most pathetic gush; like the whine of a highwayman "persecuted" from his bloody attempt to murder and rob you of your dearest

rights. How gladly would we be able to say that this denial of the right of private opinion, and this affirmation of Romish right to crush it out by force and bloodshed when Rome has the power, was renounced by Romanists in our America. But it is still held, and not exercised only for *want of power*. The very terms of the learned Doctor's own statement of the *three steps* show that his whole soul is in favor of the crushers. That Protestants should claim religious freedom, that they should, rather than be enslaved, prefer to attain the supremacy, nay, that they should even exterminate their exterminators, is in the Doctor's view a very great impertinence on the part of Protestants. That such views as his could be boldly uttered in this our free Protestant America displays great sincerity and heroism. We wait for his next article, hoping to profit by some acute criticisms on the new version from his stand-point.

North American Review, July, 1881. (New York.)—1. Present Aspects of the Indian Problem; by Carl Schurz. 2. The Religious Conflicts of the Age; by A Yankee Farmer. 3. The Power of Public Plunder; by James Parton. 4. The Common Sense of Taxation; by Henry George. 4. The Cost of Cruelty; by Henry Bergh. 6. A Study of Tennyson; by Richard Henry Stoddard.

August.—1. The Christian Religion; by Robert G. Ingersoll, Jeremiah S. Black. 2. Obstacles to Annexation; by Frederic G. Mather. 3. Crime and Punishment in New York; by Rev. Dr. Howard Crosby. 4. A Militia for the Sea; by John Roach. 5. Astronomical Observatories; by Prof. Simon Newcomb. 6. The Public Lands of the United States; by Thomas Donaldson.

September.—1. The Church, the State, and the School; by Prof. W. T. Harris. 2. Natural Ethics; by M. J. Savage. 3. The Monroe Declaration; John A. Kasson. 4. Shall Church Property be Taxed?; by Rev. E. E. Hale. 5. Jewish Ostracism in America; by Nina Morais. 6. The Decay of New England Thought; by Rev. J. H. Ward; 7. Ghost-Seeing; by Prof. F. H. Hedge. 8. Factitious History; by Rossiter Johnson.

The article on Natural Ethics, by M. J. Savage, is simply a flippant specific chapter from what we call the great Brutalistic Philosophy. The writer begins, as is usual with his class, to pour forth a jubilate over the approaching downfall of Christianity. He tells, with a very self-confident magniloquence, about the growing disbelief of the Bible as an infallibility; that "the best conscience of the age" rejects the God of the Bible, etc., etc. The coterie of mutual admirers who chant this sort of triteness, we have little doubt, are perfectly sincere, and still less doubt are most egregious simpletons. They are ignorant of the plainest historic and statistical facts of the past and present in regard to the actual power, growth, and gigantic advances of the Bible Christianity of to-day.

They know nothing of the millions annually poured forth by Christian liberality every year. They see nothing of the rapid multiplication of Christian churches, colleges, and theological schools in this, and growingly in every other land of the habitable globe. They overlook the vast associate agencies of Christianity, translating the Bible and its attendant literature into every language, and scattering its copies in every land. Biblical literature, they are unaware, has never before builded such libraries of commentary, travels, researches, and developments as at this hour. They never count the missionaries that are going forth, forming Churches in India, in China, Japan, and winning the isles of the sea to Christ. They have not dreamed, what is true, that Christianity, in all her past history, never increased so rapidly, going forth conquering and to conquer so triumphantly, as during the last seventy years. They take no cognizance of the statistical fact that evangelical Christianity shows a more rapid increase than our national population. Does the wonderful sensation, religious, literary, commercial, and popular, over the appearance of the new version of the New Testament indicate that the Bible is growing obsolete? Some years since a New York meeting called to honor Mr. Tyndall as a scientist seemed to indicate that infidelity was mounting the ascendant; but in a few brief days an infidel convention assembled in the same city and the orators therein were left to mouth their blasphemies to each other and the empty benches. And perhaps no assemblage ever caused such a week of moral excitement in this city as the Evangelical Alliance about the same period. When we contemplate the earnest and stupendous movements now being made by Christianity and then turn to see these flatulent vaporers, sitting on their cushions like a true "rump parliament" and declaiming about the downfall of Christianity, we are strongly reminded of Thersites in Homer railing at the chiefs and armies of Greece, and think it time for some Ulysses to lay due castigation upon their effervescences.

Never has Christian literature been so immense, so bold, so learned and triumphant as now. Infidels find their attacks not shunned, but promptly met and routed. Look at the immense library of Christian literature poured out by the Clarkes of Edinburgh. Notice our own powerful "Book Concern," the

Bible House, and the many religious publishing houses of America. Who can count the issues of religious newspapers? Con the pages of our synopsis, and see what a list of religious Quarterlies. And we hang out our colors boldly, while anti-christianity inserts itself under euphemistic cover. We have "Christian Advocates," but no bold "Infidel Advocate;" we have "Wesleyan Journals," but no "Tom Paine Journals," no "Voltaire Intelligencers." Our Christian Quarterlies are not ashamed of even their denominational names, but are "The Methodist Quarterly Review," "The Presbyterian Quarterly Review," "The Baptist Review," etc. But Mr. Savage does not record his boasts and doctrinal brutalisms in "The Brutalistic Review," nor have we any above-board "Atheist Quarterly" or "Agnostic Magazine."

Mr. Savage rejects the supernatural and transcendent; holding that all living, intellectual, and moral nature emerges by heredity from below, and nothing comes to man from above. We are evolved from brute nature, and are nothing but more complexly brute ourselves. The human race is a joint-stock menagerie, and ethics is nothing more than a calculation of joint-stock interest. This calculation simply concerns our comfortable condition. It is developed in man, the more complex brute, from the nature of the simpler brute. It is the same in kind but more "specialized" in degree. The hedgehog and the hyena rule themselves by the same ethics as the homo. The brutes are as real, but less developed, philosophers. Mr. S. knows no immortality. Man, like his fellow brute, exhales all the soul he has with his final breath. And so we have an exposition, after the latest and most improved pattern, of the true, orthodox, elevated, ennobling, all-conquering Brutalistic Philosophy.

Universalist Quarterly, July, 1881. (Boston.)—1. Origin, History, and Doctrines of the Ancient Jewish Sects; by Rev. O. D. Miller. 2. A Study of American Archæology—Process of Investigation; by Rev. J. P. MacLean. 3. The New Orthodoxy; by A. C. Barry, D.D. 4. Paul's Gospel; by Rev. J. Smith Dodge. 5. The Sacrifice of Christ; by Rev. S. S. Hebberd. 5. Science and Art in Relation to Plant Life; Rev. S. H. M'Collester. 7. The Gospel for all the World; by J. G. Adams, D.D.

The "Universalist Quarterly" evinces its repugnance to neology by its cool reception of Robertson Smith's Lectures, and its opposition to the materialism of Maudsley and Ham-

mond, by narrating authentic facts showing that mind does often perceive beyond the reach of the physical instrumentalities of the senses. It furnishes, as illustration, the autobiographic account given by the eminent German scientist, litterateur, and preacher, Heinrich Zschokke, of his own frequent mental perception, when he met a stranger, of the most vivid and accurate scenes and doings of the person's past life. People came to him invested with their own antecedents; which seems much like an anticipation of that recognition of each other in the resurrection state which we have described in our note on 1 Cor. xv, 44. The editor also narrates the perception by Swedenborg, when in Gottenburg, of a fire at that moment taking place in Stockholm, three hundred miles distant, attested (in a letter given in full) as being beyond all question by the eminent German philosopher Kant. Both these narratives are facts, and facts that materialistic pseudo-science cannot explain.

We said, in a former Quarterly, that such indubitable facts are constantly occurring, often suppressed, but often published and intentionally forgotten. They are appearing every now and then, uncontradicted and inexplicable, in the daily newspapers. Here is one from the "London Daily News," in regard to the celebrated Assyriologist George Smith, and his friend, Dr. Delitzsch:

Mr. Smith, the Assyriologist, died at Aleppo on the 19th of August, at or about the hour of six in the afternoon. On the same day, and between three quarters of an hour and an hour later, a friend and fellow-worker of Mr. Smith's (Dr. Delitzsch) was going to the house of a third person, the author of the account of the labors of the departed scholar which appeared in a weekly contemporary, (the "Academy.") In the course of his walk Dr. Delitzsch passed within a stone's throw of the house in which Mr. Smith lived when in London, and suddenly heard his own name uttered aloud in a "most piercing cry," which thrilled him to the marrow. The fact impressed him so strongly that he looked at his watch, noted the hour, and, although he did not mention the circumstance at the time, recorded it in his note-book. In this particular case, as it is reported, the skeptic can scarcely make much use of the fact that Dr. Delitzsch did not mention his experience to any one at the time it happened. The record in his note-book would be amply sufficient evidence of the liveliness of the impression. Criticism would be better employed in discovering the possibility of a suggestion of Mr. Smith to Dr. Delitzsch's mind. He was at the moment "passing the

of Crogsland road in which Mr. George Smith lived." He was, however, not thinking of him, and it is difficult to imagine that an unconscious suggestion of the brain, caused by the law of the association of ideas, could take the shape of a seeming cry, not of his friend's name, but of his own, so piercing as to thrill him to the marrow.

The following we take from the "New York Times:"

SINGULAR INCIDENT CONNECTED WITH BISHOP LEE'S DEATH.

A private letter from Davenport, Iowa, received in Boston, contains the following: "We have been very anxious the last two weeks over the illness of Bishop Lee, which terminated in his death on Saturday morning. The whole community is saddened by the event. Some two months ago he got up in the night and took a bath, and on returning to his room he made a mistake and stepped off a long flight of stairs, and landed at the foot with a tremendous crash, as he was very heavy, weighing over two hundred pounds. It aroused the whole family, and Mrs. Lee and Carrie sprang from their beds, and, lighting each a candle, went to see what had happened, and found the Bishop lying on the floor of the entry. He got up, however, without aid, and seemed to have received no injury except a few slight bruises, though his right hand was a little lamed. Mr. H. and myself called on him two days after, and while telling us the circumstance of the fall he mentioned this coincidence: He had a letter in his hand, which he had just received from his son Henry, living at Kansas City. His son wrote: 'Are you well? for last night I had a dream that troubles me. I heard a crash, and, standing up, said to my wife, "Did you hear that crash?" I dreamed that father had a fall and was dead. I got up and looked at my watch, and it was 2 o'clock. I could not sleep again, so vivid was the dream.' And it made him anxious to hear from home. The Bishop said he was not superstitious, but he thought it remarkable that Henry should have had the dream at the very hour of the same night that the accident occurred. The difference in the time there and here is just fifteen minutes, and it was 2:15 by his watch, making it at the same moment. It was as if he had actually heard the fall. And the fall finally caused the Bishop's death. His hand became intensely painful, and grangrene set in, which, after two weeks of suffering, terminated his life."

Now, it cannot be conceived that a fire at Stockholm pictured itself on the retina of Swedenborg at Gottenburg, or that a sound from Asia, by atmospheric vibration, touched the tympanum of Delitzsch at London. Nor could a special air-wave go from Davenport to Kansas City to strike on Henry's ear-drum. Without the material organ the mind must have seen

and heard. And the idea seems to suggest itself that the organism is as much a *limitation* upon the far-reaching powers of the soul as an *instrument* of its ordinary action. And such facts are so numerous that "criticism" cannot be allowed to palm upon them any sham interpretations.

This "Quarterly" tells us that fifty years ago the "evangelical" pulpits proclaimed "that the heathen generally would be given over to the devil and eternal torments." Such has never been the doctrine of Methodism nor the teaching of her pulpits. The old Arminians of Holland rejected it; Wesley and Fletcher and all our standards repudiate it. The doctrine of Dr. Fowler, quoted by this "Quarterly," is at variance with our Methodist standards.

Quarterly Review of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, July, 1881 (Nashville, Tenn.)—1. The Genesis of Infidelity; by Geo. T. Gould, D.D. 2. The Benson Family: Father and Son; by George J. Stevenson, M.A. 3. Carlyle's Reminiscences; by President A. B. Stark. 4. The Sabbath; by Rev. E. O. Peterson. 5. The Memorial Volume; by J. B. Wardlaw, Jun., M.A. 6. Holiness and Sin—New Theory Noticed; by T. N. Ralston, D.D. 7. Wesleyan Methodism. 8. Prophecy: its Interpretation and Uses; by Henry Cowles, D.D. 9. May Women Preach? 10. The Revised Version of the English New Testament. 11. The Church Corrupted; by Rev. John Armitage.

The Quarterly of our Southern sister Church is always a welcomed visitor at our table. We note with pleasure that the names of the contributors appear with the articles, so that we may in due time learn who form the literary republic of Southern Methodism. Our own Quarterly usually presents some contribution from the ablest pens of the South. The articles of the Southern are rather too short for the full unfolding of a topic for which a Quarterly exists. The editorial, beside the book notices, has a multifarious miscellany of literary matters, where high literary dignity sometimes drops, perhaps, into a too colloquial phraseology.

The editor, who is himself a commentator, has taken a great interest in the Revised Version, especially in the matter of a correct text. His critical judgment indicates that if the Revision Committee were now to be selected he would be the proper representative of our Church South, in the work. His judgment of the Revision, as a substitute for the Old Version, is adverse:

We repeat the *caveat* which we gave in April, as a careful examination of the R. V. satisfies us that the English-speaking

Churches will never adopt it "to be read in Churches" till it is subjected to a more careful revision.—P. 494.

He imputes to our last Quarterly a *twit* and a *fling* at "the illiteracy of the South," and advises us to read Dr. Haygood. But *twit* and *fling* are below the level of our Quarterly, and the very words are below the normal level of its vocabulary. It has uttered in the past many rebukes and criticisms, but always in a serious and earnest style, worthy of the dignity of the subject, and solely with a view not to malign, but to produce a reformatory effect. It is unjust in Dr. Summers to impute to us any desire to depreciate, offend, or wrong the South.

By this time he knows that we have read Dr. H. with high approval, and have noted the contrast between Macon and Nashville. When the South takes firm and active stand on Dr. Haygood's platform the echoes of rebuke from the North will be gladly silent, and the waves of approval and congratulation will roll southward. And here we record our pleasure at the magnificent success of the meeting of the National Teachers' Association at Atlanta; at the noble lead given by the eloquent Governor Colquit, of Georgia, and the appointment of that distinguished Southern educator, Dr. G. J. Orr, as President of the National Association. And the "Atlanta Exposition" will open before our eyes a vista of the new, free, industrial, prosperous South, over which the Southerner's gratification cannot be higher than ours. Many of the people of our South have been asking compensation for their slaves. The South will receive it, a hundred and a thousand fold, in that grand prosperity which the abolition of slavery has inaugurated, and which never could have existed under the old iron system. She would have had it, a hundred and a thousand fold, long ere this, had she struck for freedom when Garrison first rang the "fire-bell in the night" of "immediate emancipation." That terrible bell-ringer was the South's truest friend. Such is the romance of our history!

And another flash of that romance has just crossed our national sky in the assassination of our President. How has the whole nation's heart melted by his apparently dying bed! One great national sympathy has fused all hearts into oneness: and we are again, as in the olden time, and better, one people as one man. Such immediacy, spontaneity, and unanimity of feeling

were poured from the South as from the North; and we have all one loyal heart for our common Great Republic. Sectional confidence is being restored, and our Southern brethren will yet find and feel that it was a great mistake to suppose we cherished hatred in our hearts. By the light of this flash of the assassin's pistol all eyes have been able to see the simplicity and the grandeur, the goodness and the greatness, of our President's nature; and, as a great sufferer, he has achieved more than the greatest of exploits could have wrought.

BAPTIST REVIEW, July, August, September, 1881. (Cincinnati.)—1. The Natural Headship of Adam; by Rev. Philip S. Moxom. 2. The Apocalypse—its Authorship and its Date; by D. W. Phillips, D.D. 3. The Baptism of Fire; by Rev. C. E. Smith. 4. The Moral and Spiritual Elements of the Atonement; by Rev. George B. Stevens. 5. The Mother of God; by C. E. W. Dobbs, D.D. 6. A Study of the Inquisition; by Rev. J. C. Fernald. 7. The Place of Preaching in the Plan of God; by Rev. J. M. Taylor. 8. Fasting as a Religious Exercise—its Place and Purpose; by Rev. P. A. Nordell.

The article on the Natural Headship of Adam is an able refutation of the Calvinistic doctrine of "hereditary guilt," in the sense of a direct lineal damnation of those born of Adam. This doctrine is thus stated: "Adam's sin entailed guilt and penalty. It entailed guilt and penalty for himself; but as he was the race, his sin entailed guilt and penalty for the race."

We may here note that Mr. Wesley excluded this doctrine of "hereditary guilt" from our Twenty-five Articles. From the Ninth Article of the Church of England his own hand erased the words, (in regard to original sin,) AND, THEREFORE, IN EVERY PERSON THAT IS BORN INTO THE WORLD IT DESERVETH GOD'S WRATH AND DAMNATION.

The doctrine, then, of a born desert of wrath and damnation is not Wesleyan. He struck the doctrine out, and, if we are herein Wesleyan, we strike it out also. This does not deny the doctrine of what is called Original Sin; nor of the sinward tendency of the natural man; nor the contrariety between the purity of God and this sinwardness of man. It does deny its responsibility; its DESERT OF WRATH AND DAMNATION. "Hereditary guilt" in the sense of desert of wrath and damnation, is expressly excluded from our Wesleyan Theology by Wesley's latest authority. As Dr. Fisk well affirms, man is never responsible for his hereditary "fault" until he has made it his own by personal actual sin; and that saves our theology from the doctrine of "infant damnation."

The article on the Atonement denies the "commercial view;" denies that "punishment" was transferred to Christ; affirms that Christ's sufferings satisfied "the righteous element in divine love;" and that it "testifies to the guilt of sin, and proclaims the righteousness of God in its punishment."

English Reviews.

British and Foreign Evangelical Review, July, 1881. (London.)—1. Recent Attacks on Calvinism; by Rev. R. M'Cheyne Edgar. 2. The Christian Ministry Not a Priesthood; by Rev. John Kelly. 3. Culdee Colonies in the North and West; by Rev. John Campbell. 4. A Great Doxology. 5. The Liberal Theology; by Sup.-Lic. Gust. Kreibig. 6. Presbyterian Consolidation in Canada; by Rev. Robert Campbell, M.A. 7. The Reasonableness of Faith; by Principal Shairp. 8. Inspiration; by Dr. A. A. Hodge and Prof. B. B. Warfield.

Indian Evangelical Review, July, 1881. (Calcutta.)—1. The Sunday-School in India; by Rev. T. J. Scott, D.D. 2. List of Important Scriptural Terms, with proposed Renderings in Bengali. 3. The Primacy of the Bishop of Rome; by the editor. 4. Historical Sketches of Primary Education in the Madras Presidency; by Rev. James Cooling. 5. The Great Commission, Matt. xxviii, 19; by Rev. D. Downie. 6. India's Immediate Conversion; by a Young Missionary. 7. Santal Kherwarism in Chutia Nagpore and Santal Pergannas; by Rev. A. Campbell. 8. Modern Spiritualism: Its Claims and Pretensions; by an English Medical Missionary.

Westminster Review, July, 1881. (New York.)—1. Characteristics of Aristotle. 2. Island Life. 3. Mr. Fitzgerald's Life of George the Fourth. 4. The Sugar Bounties Question. 5. The Development of Religion. 6. George Eliot: her Life and Writings.

London Quarterly Review, July, 1881. (New York.)—1. Madame de Staël: A Study of her Life and Times. 2. Sir Richard Temple's "India in 1880." 3. Earthquakes, their Cause and Origin. 4. Thomas Aquinas and the Vatican. 5. Walks in England. 6. Florence. 7 Schliemann's "Ilios." 8. Radical History and Tory Government. 9. English Trade and Foreign Competition.

London Quarterly Review, July, 1881. (London.)—1. Lord Clyde and the Indian Mutiny. 2. Japanese Laureates. 3. The Hampden of Holland, 4. Degeneration. 5. The Italian and Scotic Missions to Northumbria. 6. The Rights of Hindu Women. 7. Prehistoric Europe and Man. 7. The Wesleyan Hymnology; Recent Criticism. 9. The Revised Version.

The article of Degeneration calls our attention to the fact that genetic evolution has been mistaken in affirming that all development is upward and never downward. There is in nature, under the proper conditions, *degeneration* as well as exaltation. The conditions of this degeneration are given as three:

1. Parasitism is a very general cause of degeneration. "Any new set of conditions occurring to an animal which render its food and safety very easily attained, seem to lead, as a rule, to degeneration. . . . The habit of parasitism clearly acts upon

animal organization in this way. Let the parasitic life once be secured, and away go legs, jaws, eyes, and ears; the active, highly-gifted crab, insect, or annelid may become a mere sac, absorbing nourishment and laying eggs." 2. Fixity or immobility is another reason, as we see in the case of the barnacle. 3. Another cause of the degeneration of animal forms is distinguished as *vegetative nutrition.* "Let us suppose a race of animals fitted and accustomed to catch their food, and having a variety of organs to help them in this chase—suppose such animals suddenly to acquire the power of feeding on the carbonic acid dissolved in the water around them, just as green plants do. This would lead to a degeneration; they would cease to hunt their food, and would bask in the sunlight, taking food in by the whole surface, as plants do by their leaves. Certain small flat worms, by name Convoluta, of a bright green color, appear to be in this condition. Their green color is known to be the same substance as leaf-green; and Mr. Patrick Geddes has recently shown that by the aid of this green substance they feed on carbonic acid, making starch from it as plants do. As a consequence, we find that their stomachs and intestines, as well as their locomotive organs, become simplified, since they are but little wanted."—Pp. 363, 364.

Now these three conditions upon inspection will, we think, be found reducible to one, *inactivity,* or rather the cessation of the need of activity for satisfied existence. The hardships of life requiring exertion for existence are the sources of improvement, progress, elevation. All nature, perhaps, must thus *work* to obtain ascendency in the scale of being.

Applying this to the races of mankind, it is said that the law of human progress and regress is explained. Hardships train a people to action, and the ascendency or even supremacy is thereby attained. But the repose of victory is the fatal beginning of decay. Prof. Lankester maintains, however, that science is to the human race the source of safety. Men *know the causes of decline,* and thence are able to avoid them. Hence, for our race at its present summit of advancement, the course of ascendant progress is a plain, clear, maintainable line. To this our reviewer demurs.

He denies that the *knowledge* is likely to secure the requisite action. Will a people at the summit of prosperous ease subject themselves to the hardships of their earlier adversity? The very nature of their enjoyment secures that enervation which is the very *exhaustion of the power* of energetic action. And hence he concludes that the true safeguard lies in the transcendent

element of our *spiritual nature.* The value of that element we readily concede; but our spiritual elevation must not be of the Simon Stylites order, for that produced degeneration.

The source of elevation, the proof against degeneration, let us call *athletism.* It is the vigorous training of our whole nature to its highest tension, physical, mental, moral. Now is it necessary, in order to this *athletic* training, to reproduce the hardships of barbarian or semi-civilized life? May not action be as attainable, and as fully motived, by the desire of higher ascendencies as by the lower? May not each new level of life become platform for further arduous exertion for a still higher step of the terrace? That lower stage was but one of the lower platforms of the terrace. Where is the topmost plane that leaves no incitement for the higher?

Both Moses and Darwin declare for an ascending evolution. According to both ascending progress is the law, degeneration is the limited exception. And the degeneration tends to destruction, and so the ascent becomes cleaner and more positive. The first chapter of Genesis gives us the ascending steps. Assuming, as we do, the immutability of the boundary line between species, large on any view may be the area of mutability within the boundary of a given species. We know what varieties are included within the limits of humanity. We are not convinced that any lower species has crossed the line up into humanity; we do not believe that man on earth will ever cross the upper line and rise above humanity. But as our Genesis pictures the process by which man attained his supremacy at the head of creation, so our Apocalypse tells us of man's gradual attainment of the height of his own terrene nature, and then the sudden more than restoration of his Edenic state.

On The Revised Version the verdict of this Review accords very much with our own expressed opinion:

> On the average, every verse of the New Testament undergoes some change, and every change may be said, as a rule, to aim at a more faithful rendering of the Greek. The reader, as he goes on, is presently arrested by some unfamiliar expression, and immediately, as matter of course, revolts against it. On second thoughts, and with the Greek before him, he finds that he has a more exact English rendering of the passage. Either the order of the words, or a new term introduced, or some slight omission corrects the sentence in an undefinable manner, and thus gives

him—the reader—the pleasant feeling of having the writer's thought more clearly in his mind. It will always—or at least for a long time—be matter of question whether it would not have been better to leave hundreds of these emendations alone. We should not be at all surprised if these should long hinder the acceptance of the book, though, for ourselves, we think them most valuable, and must vote in their favor. . . . Meanwhile, we venture to assert that the present translation of the New Testament is in a thousand instances more precise, as a reflection of the sacred original, than the old one, and that this fact ought to settle the question of its success. . . . Even supposing the prognostications of many to be fulfilled, and the New Version never to supersede the Old one in authorized use, it will be a great advantage that it was ever published. It will prove to be one of the most useful theological helps of the many which are constantly pouring from the press.—Pp. 480, 481.

The article on PREHISTORIC MAN IN EUROPE has the following paragraph on the HYMN OF THE CREATION of Genesis i:

The most ancient traditions of civilization are concentered around that Eastern region which the Book of Genesis points to as the cradle of the race. A hundred years ago it could not have been demonstrated, as it can now, that the languages spoken between Iceland and Bengal are descended from the same stock. A very ingenious article has lately been published in the "Dublin Review" by the Roman Catholic Bishop of Clifton on the first thirty-four verses of Genesis. He is of opinion that it is a hymn of ancient Egypt which Moses introduced into his history. The monumental Records and other authorities quoted by the Bishop, refer to the dedication of each day of the week in separate worship; and he thinks that the hymn belongs to the earliest and purest period of the religion which flourished on the banks of the Nile. Whether the hymn is due to such an origin or not, there is at least so much evidence furnished of a simple, theistic worship in Egypt in the earliest period, confirming other testimony to "the heaven which lies about us in our infancy," and which was vividly near to the primitive peoples.

This idea first appeared, we believe, in "The Aids to Faith," from the pen of Rev. Mr. Rorison, and was favorably noticed by our Quarterly. Our view of it, however, was that it is an antediluvian hymn inherited from the Church of the first-born of men. It came with Abraham from Chaldea, and George Smith's records indicate that it was truly rhythmical. It may also have come down to and through Egypt by another stream of tradition. The thought has been beautifully wrought out by Prof. Cocker, of the University of Michigan, in his work on Theism.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, July, 1881. (New York.)—1. Methodism. 2. Cæsar's Campaigns in Britain. 3. Sweden under Gustavus III. 4. The Society of Antiquaries. 5. Japan Revolutionized. 6. The Revised Version of the New Testament. 7. General Shadwell's Life of Lord Clyde. 8. Philippsen's Henri IV. and Philip III. 9. The Storage of Electricity. 10. Landlords and Tenants in Ireland.

The article on METHODISM is free in its criticisms, yet no way intentionally uncandid. We give only its estimates of the forces of Methodism:

With strong confidence in the accuracy of our statements, we compute the adherents of Methodism at five millions in connection with the Bristol Conferences and fourteen millions with the American. The ecclesiastical property in Great Britain may be calculated at eleven millions, and in America at eighteen millions sterling. The annual contributions for purely Methodist purposes in Great Britain amount to two and a half millions sterling, and in the rest of Methodism to three times that amount.—P. 17.

The judgment upon the Revised Version is decidedly adverse:

In conclusion, we reiterate our disappointment with this Revised Version as a whole. It will remain a monument of the industry of its authors and a treasury of their opinions and erudition; but, unless we are entirely mistaken, until its English has undergone thorough revision it will not supplant the Authorized Version. After all, the chief use of the present attempt will be as a work of reference in which the grammatical niceties of the New Testament diction are treated with labored fidelity. It will no more furnish an authorized version to eighty millions of English-speaking people than any number of *mémoires pour servir* will give them a standard history. The superior critical apparatus at the disposal of our scholars, and their advanced scientific knowledge of grammar, seem to have been rather impediments than aids; and we are left with another critical commentary on the New Testament, but not with a new version which will mold our thoughts and afford a dignified vehicle for the great truths of revelation.—P. 96.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1881. (London.)—1. Augustodunum. 2. Carlyle, and Mrs. Carlyle: A Ten-Years' Reminiscence. 3. New Policy of the Vatican. 4. The Land Difficulty in India. 5. The Revised Version of the New Testament. 6. The French Republic.

The decision of this Quarterly upon the New Revision is somewhat dubious:

It is almost impossible, in a critical paper, to avoid dwelling mainly on the demerits rather than on the merits of a book. Our business here has been criticism and not panegyric, and we have said little of numerous improvements made by the revisers; but we cannot close without again expressing our sense of the high value of this version, which is an honor to the scholarship

of our time, and a gift of real value to the Christian Church. The marginal notes will be found to be a mine of information, and will be helpful to the student of the Greek Testament as well as to the English reader. Whether this Revision becomes, as its predecessor did, the New Testament of England for a long period, or is soon superseded by another, we feel sure that the English New Testament will always continue to bear many marks of the painstaking hand of the revisers of 1881.—P. 143.

German Reviews.

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews.) 1881. Fourth Number. *Essays:* 1. BEYSCHLAG, The Apostolic Apothegms and Our Four Gospels. 2. ZOCKLER, Dionysius the Carthusian, and his Book *De Vanitate Mundi*. *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. TRECHSEL, Was Servetus with Luther in Wittenberg? 2. KRAAKE, Was Luther's Mother a born Ziegler? 3. Bohl, Ancient Christian Inscriptions. *Reviews:* GODET, *Commentaire sur l'épître aux Romains*, reviewed by DIESTERBECK. 2. HEINRICI, The First Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians, reviewed by SCHMIDT.

Decidedly the most interesting article in this number is that by Böhl on "The Ancient Christian Inscriptions." He commences his treatise by a generous reference to the work in this line now being done by the French *savants* Le Bas and Waddington—the latter recently minister of Instruction in France. The French government has kindly sustained these investigations, and the famous Villemain, while Minister some forty years ago, paid special attention to this study. Le Bas traveled over Greece and its islands and Asia Minor, and as a result of his labors published a valuable work entitled, *Inscriptions Grecques et Latines*. These inscriptions were printed up to the number 1,898, when the learned and industrious author died, and Waddington was intrusted with the labor of finishing the undertaking. He traveled over the same ground and profited by the researches of Le Bas, and extended them on the same line. The result of his labors was a valuable treatise on inscriptions gathered in Greece, Asia Minor, and Syria. This work appears in numbers, commencing with the year 1870, and it is still in the course of publication.

Besides this monumental publication we may quote the important labors of Dr. Wetzstein, Consul at Damascus, extensively used by the reviewer, and those of Professor Kirchhoff in the "Transactions of the Royal Academy at Berlin."

De Vogué's *Architecture de la Syrie Centrale*, in two volumes, is very learned, as is also the *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, by Curtius and Kirchhoff. The fourth volume of this publication contains Christian inscriptions. Among the 2,841 inscriptions given thus far, in the serial of Le Bas and Waddington, are some which strongly attract the eyes of theologians. These are specially the ancient Christian inscriptions according to the text of the Septuagint thus transmitted to our period. These are of special interest from their contents and their form. Their contents prove to us the familiarity of the Christians of Syria, of the land east of the Jordan, and Arabia, with the Old Testament in the Greek version of the Septuagint, and this at a period when the sources of this knowledge flowed but sparingly, namely, from the fourth to the seventh century after Christ. They seem thus to fill out a chasm in Church history. With regard to their form, these inscriptions present to us the Bible text in a shape in which it appears in extremely few manuscripts. We allude to the form of the text of the Septuagint from the fourth to the seventh century, which was not changed in the course of this time, and now appears inscribed on these tables of stone. The accord of the text of these inscriptions with that of the present *Codex Vaticanus* is very patent on examination. The variations are quite irrelevant aside from errors of orthography, provincialisms, and the arbitrary changes which lie in the nature of the case.

And in this same number there is still another article on Servetus, discussing the question of his presence with Luther in Wittenberg. This same Servetus certainly receives a great meed of honor from investigators and reviewers, who would seem never to tire of reference to the great literary hero of his period. This time, however, it is not Tollin, but a new investigator who dares to question some of the points laid down by Tollin, which will probably give rise to a new controversy of endless length and a ransacking of all the theological libraries of Europe for authorities. But Trechsel is quite likely to have the sympathies of the German scholars of the day, who are certainly growing tired of this endless stream of enthusiasm flowing from the pen of Tollin, which they would now gladly see turning to some other subject.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR KIRCHENGESCHICHTE. (Journal for Church History.) Edited by Dr. BRIEGER. Vol. V, No. 1. *Essays:* 1. STEUDE, On the Origin of the Cathari. 2. KELLER, On the History of the Anabaptists, (1538.) 3. BUDDENSIEG, John Henry Newman and his Share in the Oxford Movement. *Critical Reviews:* TH. SCHOTT, History of French Protestantism, Literature of the Years 1870–80. *Analecta:* 1. BAETHGEN, Philoxenus on the Faith. 2. WINTER, History of Bishop Anselm of Havelberg. 3. *Epistolæ Reformatorum* in the Church Library at Neustadt on Aisch, with a Supplement by TH. BRIEGER.

German Church historians are now vigorously turning their attention to the history of the Anabaptists among them, who for a while they had seemed to forget. Karl Kraft, in a recent volume of the "Transactions of the Association of Rhenish Pastors," reminds his colleagues of the influence of this sect in the Protestant movements in Switzerland, West Germany, and the Netherlands. The labors of Bouterwek, of Holland, brought many new facts to light, and more recently the Dutch theologian De Wederdoopers and the German Von Egli have opened up a new current in their accounts of the Anabaptists during the period of the Reformation. And still there is more to be said by the author of the present article on the history of this sect in its stronghold at Münster. The Dutch historian, Hoop-Scheffer, declares that the history of the Anabaptists of Holland, during the Reformation, ran parallel with that great movement, and the same may be asserted of certain German territories. By the aid of this work Anabaptist communities have been discovered where there was previously no suspicion of their existence, and the author hints that Catholic writers have intentionally ignored the history of their existence and trials. A persistent effort was made by many chroniclers to represent the sect as the quintessence of all vileness and blasphemy, and they did not in some quarters recover from this base slander until they laid aside the name of Anabaptists and assumed that of "Mennonites." In later years many of these left Germany in a body and settled in the plains of Southern Russia, under promise of protection from the government. This pledge has not been fulfilled to the satisfaction of these people, and they are now emigrating in large numbers to our own land, and settling in colonies in the north-west.

The article on "French Protestantism and its Literature in the Last Four Years" is a critical and valuable review of this interesting subject. Some five years ago, in this same Review, Dr. Schott treated at large of French Protestantism in the year

1875, and then made a reputation for thorough and honest research in this matter, so that a continuation of the subject from his pen will be received with pleasure by German scholars. The article is quite free from that hidden vein of contempt that too often mars all German criticism of any thing in France, and the author treats his French contemporaries as colleagues and brothers in the great Protestant work. He acknowledges the assistance received from the records of the *Société de l'histoire du Protestantisme Français*, and quotes this energetic body as the solid center for the history of the French Protestants. Whoever will study this interesting thesis will find in its members friendly assistance and true counsel. By its annual convocations, its literary organ, and its periodical bulletin; by the library which it has established and the prizes that are offered for valuable essays on its hundred subjects, it has greatly forwarded the good cause of Protestantism in France and vindicated the honor of its predecessors in the work of antagonism and resistance to Catholic injustice and oppression. A very marked advantage of this society is the neutral ground that it assumes in the various minor divisions of the Protestant Church in France, which is a common bond among those whose great interests are mutual. A valuable complement to its usefulness is the publication of an "Encyclopedia of Religious Sciences," under the direction of Lichtenberger, well known as a thorough scholar and fine critic —a Frenchman, though bearing a German cognomen. Nine volumes of this work have already appeared and brought it to the letter H. It is published by the Protestant publisher of Paris, Fishbacher. The geography, ethnography, and statistics of French Protestantism given in this work can be found nowhere else in French publications, because of the custom of French critics and scholars to ignore the Protestant element in France. Hence its great usefulness.

French Reviews.

REVUE CHRETIENNE, (Christian Review.) June, 1881.—1. BRIDEL, The Pessimism of Hartmann and the Gospel, (second and last paper.) 2. ROLLER, Tolerance. 3. SAINT-ANDRE, The Arctic Regions. 4. BERGER, The Part of Dogmatics in Preaching. English Chronicle, Miscellanea, and the Monthly Review. July, 1881.—1. PETER, The Centenary of Saint Benoit at Mont Cassin. 2. SAINT-ANDRE, The Arctic Regions, (second article.) 3. VISME, On August Stahl. Philosophical Chronicle and Review of the Month.

As we opened the June and July numbers of the "*Revue Chretienne*" we were struck with the activity of the French Protestant writers at present, as displayed by the publisher's announcement of new works. Bruston, professor in the Faculty of Theology at Montauban, is out with a "Critical History of the Prophetic Literature of the Hebrews;" Sabatier, of the Protestant Theological Faculty of Paris, announces a new work on the Apostle Paul; and Bonnet-Maury, of the same Faculty, gives us a bulky volume on "The Origin of Unitary Christianity among the English." Kruger, a licentiate in theology, presents the Church with an "Essay on the Theology of Isaiah:" while Cuvier, a pastor, treats of the "Advent of Jesus Christ." Then we have the "Words of Faith and Liberty," by Bouvier, professor in the Academy of Geneva, and the "Christians of the Roman Empire," by Aubé. This very remarkable activity on the part of all branches of the Church workers, and especially among the members of the few Protestant Faculties, shows us that the laborers are comparatively many among this small but chosen and truly evangelical people, in the midst of the opposing forces of Catholicism and infidelity. And their literary labors are generally of that practical character that makes them intelligible and attractive to the lay workers in the cause as well as to the professional theologians.

The article on Tolerance in the June number by Roller is quite exhaustive, and fairly illustrates the significant history of the persecutions endured by French Protestants in the course of their history. It was suggested to the author in a very gratifying way on hearing this subject treated as a thesis by a young candidate for theological orders before the Protestant Faculty of Paris. This was no less a personage than the son of the venerable Puaux, for many years one of the foremost

of the combatants in the ranks of French Protestantism. The young Puaux made so decided an impression on his examiners that they were delighted at this promise of a new worker among them; and the auditors declared that the examiners might say, without humiliation, that they knew less than the candidate about the special matter of which he treated. The hearers loudly applauded the worthy son of a venerable father, whose pen had added so much toward exhuming and popularizing the annals of the past. The task of the young theologian was a sad one in respect to his matter, for it was quite impossible to enumerate the cases of toleration toward their faith without evoking the lugubrious specter of the great company of persecutors, among whom the Catholic clergy and Louis XIV. figured in the first ranks.

In the July number we find a very interesting article on the History of Philosophy ("*Chronique Philosophique*") by Bridel. Philosophy has been treated so vainly, and vaguely, and superficially by the French as a nation, in comparison with the labors of the German and Scotch scholars, that there is a growing desire to have the prolific subject presented to the French nation in a more solid and reliable garb. To this end the editors of the "*Revue Chretienne*" have engaged Bridel, a deep and thoughtful student in this line, to supply for their periodical a "*Bulletin Philosophique*," and this article is the first of a series, and perhaps of a regular department. The opening page gives us the platform of the author, and the sources whence he expects to find cognate matter for his labor. He would have desired to treat, in commencing, of the principal features of the condition of philosophy in France from the beginning of the century, but, in default of space for this purpose, he contents himself with detailing to the reader the principal works in French that may serve as guides and teachers in this matter. The first authority quoted is Damiron, ("*Essai sur l'histoire de la Philosophie en France au XIX^e^ siècle.*") This work is declared to be now a little antiquated, while that of Poitou is too hasty, ("*Les Philosophes Contemporains Français.*") The Reviews of Renouvier, in his "*Année Philosophique*," are highly spoken of, and our own observations would authorize us in saying that this author is rapidly growing in power and influence among the French Protestants. Taine is

especially recommended in his treatise on "Eclecticism and its Antecedents," while Cousin, of course, holds a high place in philosophical disquisition. But the highest praise is given to the "*Histoire de la Philosophie en France au XIX^e^ siècle*," now in course of publication by Ferraz, professor in the Faculty of Letters in Lyons. This work fills an actual chasm, and traces, for the first time, in a series of careful essays, well written and happily grouped, a general and complete tableau of all the philosophical systems that have appeared in France since the beginning of the present century. Four volumes of this work have already appeared; the first devoted to the study of socialism, naturalism, and positivism; and the second to the traditionalistic and ultramontane tendencies. The closing essay of the first volume is dedicated to "semi-rationalistic socialism;" and in the last essay of the second volume he treats of Christian "semi-rationalism," as well as "Gallilean rationalism," and other phases that lead him to the spiritualistic school of thinkers, to whom he proposes to devote his third volume, while a fourth will contain a review of all the most recent schools now struggling for recognition. It must be conceded that in endeavoring to present a harmonious study of all these authors M. Bridel has undertaken a giant task, and if his "*Bulletin Philosophique*" continues its course until this task is finished, the readers of the "*Revue*" will be favored with his contributions for many a year yet. We are glad to acknowledge that his first "Bulletin" in this number is a veritable review article, and gives promise of thoughtful and fruitful work.

The review of the month by Pressensé, the responsible editor, is a very rich and attractive collection of facts and opinions concerning the living questions of the day. It is quite difficult for a French reviewer to confine himself to questions of mere thought and theory; begin where he will he must step aside in order, for a moment, to treat of the questions of the day. His views in relation to the last hours of Littré are a little peculiar, and, we think, tinged with a little jealousy, because the work of conversion, if such took place, was effected by the priests and nuns admitted to his bedside by the wife and daughter. But he regards the whole affair as quite inconclusive and unsatisfactory. But French Protestantism gladly accepts all the

new and worldly matters, as it is now stepping into the foreground in political influence, in contradistinction to its long seclusion. We see with pleasure that the new *régime* is working with success, and that the departmental synods are to meet at their prescribed dates. A semi-official synod is to meet in Marseilles in October. There is no better apprenticeship for this reviving Church than to use its liberty in cultivating activity and autonomy. These free meetings of the representatives of the Reformed Church are quite as useful as a synod that is broken and decapitated. These unofficial synods harm no one, and produce a sort of pacification which has really modified the tone of ecclesiastical journalism. Harmony is thus on the increase in the ranks of evangelical Protestantism in the form of fraternal collaboration. All those who belong to its ranks, whether official or not, feel that they are serving the same cause.

Art. IX.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

THE JEWISH QUESTION IN EUROPE.

The burning question of the hour in the line of popular religious intelligence in Europe is that of the Jewish persecutions, which continue with unabated severity in Southern and Western Russia especially. The statistics of damage and outrage in several cities are appalling. Many of those in which the Jews largely preponderated have been burned to the ground —destroyed root and branch—and this in Russia is synonymous with the total destruction of all means of existence. Witebsk (23,000 inhabitants) has been thus swept away; Bornisk, (20,000,) Mohilew, (25,000,) and a score of minor cities and settlements. The latest and most terrible are Korek and Minsk; in the former 1,020 houses and stores have been destroyed, among them the great synagogue and several smaller houses of prayer. Every thing was consumed by the flames—forty lives were lost, and 5,000 persons are absolutely without a place to lay their heads or a crust of bread to eat. In Minsk this devastation and suffering are reported as three times as great. Under these circumstances it is no wonder that the Jewish question is one of absorbing interest, and that it has called forth a timely manual that will be read far and wide in the hope of obtaining some key to the great trouble. This highly interesting and acceptable book is by a well-known publicist, who is more capable than most men of giving an honest and objective view of the matter, untinged by partisan feeling or prejudice. (*Zur Volkskunde der Juden*, by Richard Andree. Velhagen & Klasing. Leipsic, 1881.) We think the readers of

the QUARTERLY will thank us for giving them a compact *résumé* of so timely a contribution to the burning question. The author wisely touches the subject only in so far as there can be no doubt about the case, and therefore meets the scientific view of the matter. The results are thus so thorough and comprehensive that every intelligent person must find as much pleasure as profit in perusing it.

The fullness of facts displayed in this volume are very apropos to the question as to whether the Jews are a nation or a sect. The first chapter treats of the Semitic people as a nation, whose original home was in the lands south of the Caspian Sea, while the second gives us the physical HABITUS, or nature and characteristics of the people, which have at all times and in all zones remained the same. The Jew is distinguished from all other nations of the world, indeed, from all other Semitic nationalities, by his specifically Jewish exterior. The third chapter treats of the commingling of the Jews with other nationalities. Although the national religion expressly forbids this, (Deut. vii. 1–5,) it has nevertheless frequently occurred, and the Jews have issued from it victorious. It is a very interesting fact that the Jews in the Balearic Islands, who have been Christians for over four hundred years, still intermarry only among themselves. The same thing is true of the Christian Jews in Portugal, and those converted to Mohammedanism in Salonica. All examples teach us that it is simply impossible for Jews completely to mingle with other nationalities. And this, by the way, is the great complaint in Germany, namely, that the Jews do not become Germans, but remain a foreign nationality as well as a foreign sect in the bosom of the country. The non-Christian Jews cling to their nationality, even when they desert the Mosaic faith. In Prussia, of a thousand Jewish men who marry, only thirty-nine take non-Jewish wives. Thus the Jews every-where remain "strangers," as formerly in the Roman Empire, with which they refused to assimilate. In the intelligent Roman State no Christians stood over them as stern masters, but still they held their isolated position. "The Jews do not pray with the nations with which they live, celebrate no great Church festival with them, do not intermarry with them. They do not fully enter into the labor of other people, but choose that which befits their condition or suits their taste —physically and spiritually they are different from and antagonistic to the people among whom they live. Such differences stamp them every-where as a strange race. And such they remain every-where, as far as their inherited peculiarities enable them to demand recognition—that is, where their numbers are great enough to obtain it." Here Andree claims that were such a status allowed to any other nation there would be danger of a race of caste, as in India, where the castes rest partly on ethnological distinctions. Chapter four treats of the peculiar physical relations of the nation. The Jew flourishes in every climate, and multiplies with great rapidity, as he has more children and longer life than most other people. And besides this he avoids all dangerous callings, such as that of the sailor or the soldier. The fifth chapter is highly

interesting in its treatment of the *pseudo-Jews;* through the fiction of a sort of adoption through Abraham, those who are not Jews are received as such into the Mosaic community, as the Falaschas in Abyssinia, the black Jews of the Malabar coast, and the Karaites of the Crimea. Physically these people have neither the characteristics nor the tendencies of the genuine Jews.

Chapter six treats of the language of the Jews. Here, among other things, very curious specimens of "*Jew-German*" are given. The Jew's characteristic speech will often betray him in Germany when nothing else will. Chapter seven treats of Jewish names, and the eighth chapter makes us acquainted with the manners and customs among the Jews. This leads the Christian into a strange and unsympathetic world: we have not even the same chronology, for the Jew begins the year on a different day from ours. "They are in all their home-life strangers to the Germans, as were their forefathers when they first touched German soil." The tenth and last chapter gives a very valuable study of the Jews as they are scattered over the world. According to Andree they number on the whole 6,100,000, of whom about 5,225,000 live on European soil; and the volume closes with an interesting map showing the relative Jewish population in Central Europe. We need scarcely say that the book is written from a German stand-point, as the above remarks clearly show; but this makes it more interesting to the careful inquirer who would closely study the cause of the difficulty now existing between the Jews and the German nation at large.

FRENCH PROTESTANTISM.

A severe and irreparable loss has just been suffered by French Protestantism in the death of Pastor Fisch, one of its most beloved and eminent representatives, and well known in this country and England. Pressensé, his noted colleague in religious work, pays a beautiful tribute to this brother in Christ, as tender and loving as were he a brother in the flesh. The good pastor had just arrived in Switzerland for a short vacation, when he was struck with apoplexy. He leaves a void in the Free Churches of France that is incalculable. His power of work was incomparable and his zeal for the cause of the Gospel was without rival. Fisch was a Swiss by birth, and sixty-seven years old. At an early age he experienced the influence of a religious awakening, and accepted an orthodoxy that was too austere for many, but which was neither narrow nor intolerant.

He went through a course of study with the Faculty of Lausanne at a period when this body was in the height of its power and brilliancy. He began his ministerial labors at Vevay, in a little German church, whose language he spoke with a singular facility; but he was soon called to Lyons, in France, as assistant to Adolphe Monod, who had separated for a time from the official Church. The rationalistic party had succeeded in deposing this great preacher because his burning eloquence was too much for their easy conscience. When Monod definitely left

Lyons for the Faculty of Montauban, Fisch succeeded him as stated pastor in this Church, which soon became a zealous center for home mission work. He drew hundreds of recruits from Catholicism, and his Church soon became one of the distinguished centers of the Protestant Gospel, and he gave himself without reserve to the work of propagating a pure religion. In 1846 he assisted in laying the foundation in London of the Evangelical Alliance, of which it may be truly said that in the sequel he was the veritable incarnation. He afterward met with that body in Paris, Amsterdam, and New York, and he was the very soul of it in France. Before a Christian community of faith and love all petty divergence disappeared from his view. He knew no trivial rivalry nor ecclesiastical jealousy. His affectionate eye and cordial hand expressed the most heartfelt and elevated Christian love. This, indeed, was the secret of his increasing influence in French Protestantism. But this breadth of mind and heart which made him the representative of true evangelical Catholicity, did not prevent him from having well defined Christian principles. He belonged heart and soul to the cause of the Free Church, (*Eglise Libre,*) and took part in the synod of 1859, whence sprang the union of the Evangelical Churches in France. After the death of Frederic Monod he became the veritable leader in this cause, and presided over several of its synods with a rare conception of the difficult task which required a prompt and clear mind, and much tact with great impartiality. He was so clearly a model president that for twenty years he directed the synodal commission, and guided the course of the Free Churches in the most difficult period of their history in a country where they form so infinitesimal a minority, and he frequently represented them in the synods of Ireland, Scotland, England, and the United States.

Pastor Fisch was an active member of nearly all of the great Protestant religious societies. Last January we found him pleading for the great African missions which the war with the Basutos threatened to destroy. All the burden of the Evangelical Society seemed to lie on him, and as secretary he visited all its stations. He took a most active part in all home mission work, even to addressing several times weekly the popular meetings of M'All. He was pastor of the Taitbout Chapel, and preached there regularly, and gave pastoral care to one of the sections in the center of Paris, and at the same time gathered in his house at stated intervals all the young men who were looking forward to the pastoral work. One can imagine what a treasure of sympathy they found in him whose charity and love were inexhaustible. God had given him rare gifts: an extraordinary power of work, a singularly ready mind, a marvelous ease in speaking foreign languages, and great physical endurance, which, alas! he abused in doing the work of three or four men. But his greatest power was the flame that glowed within him—the deep love for Christ and for souls, and his ardent ambition to save them. His love was so expansive and his zeal so intense that they extended also to us, and therefore this feeble tribute to his memory.

Art. X.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

The German theologians are busy as ever in ceaseless efforts in their respective fields, and the list of their labors is not easily enumerated. We find Dorner, of Berlin, enriching the repertory of his works by the issue of the third volume of his System of Christian Doctrine, (*Christliche Glaubenslehre,*) of which the first and second are noticed on another page. In these he treats of the doctrine of sin, of the devil, of Christ, of the "*Official God-manhood of Christ,*" and of the post-existence of Christ in his elevation to the Godhead.

George Ebers, the most popular authority in Germany in regard to Egyptian matters, is just undertaking the publication of a work entitled, *Palestina in Bild und Wort*—that is, in pen and picture. After the completion of the magnificently illustrated work on Egypt, his publishers were desirous that he would turn his attention to the Holy Land with the same lively enthusiasm. But it happened that a similar work was projected in England by the foremost investigators of the last ten years, among whom are Wilson, Warner, and Condor, who are at the head of the undertakings of the English Palestine Association. The German publishers then resolved to give the English work in German garb, and put this task into the hands of the Leipsic *savants*, Ebers and Guthe—the latter being the editor of the journal of the German Palestine Association. The first of the sixty-five numbers that will compose the work has appeared, and treats of the city of Jerusalem. It gives promise of being brilliant and successful in spite of the crowd of works now treating of the Holy Land.

Quite a new feature among German scholars, or at least theologians, is a respectful treatment of Methodism. That there is a growing desire to know what it is, as a new and aggressive power among them, is proved by the fact that Lecky's "Origin and Characteristics of Methodism" is just announced in translation by Ferdinand Löwe, of Leipsic. The German critic acknowledges that the "Religious Revolution" brought about by the preaching of the two Wesleys and Whitefield has acquired a great significance, not only because a large, active, and powerful sect has sprung from it, that has extended over both hemispheres, but because it has also exerted a deep and lasting influence on the Established Church, and is likely to exert an influence also on the ethical powers of the nation, and affect the course of political affairs in England. With such an introduction to German thinkers in the Church, we predict that the era of contempt has passed away, and that of respectful inquiry has begun—this is all that our faithful workers on the other side now demand. This being granted, their work will certainly go forward.

Doctors of theology and philosophy are wonderfully stirred up in regard to Africa. Dr. Paulitschke is just out with an exhaustive work

on "The Geographical Exploration of the African Continent," from the most ancient period down to our day; published by Brockhausen & Bräner, in Vienna, second and enlarged edition. Such a broad programme as the entire history of African exploration, of course necessitates the review and quotation of a great many noted explorers and authors, and seems a little, in the reading, like beginning *ab ovo*. But the object is clearly to give a sort of encyclopedic review of the work, that one may overlook the entire field in one book and trace the chain of events that are so full of interest. We find, therefore, with the series of authors in its pages, embracing all the great authorities from Alexander von Humboldt down to the heroes of the hour, such as Rohlfs and Nachtigal. To this, Berghaus publishes a new "Physical Wall-map of Africa," through the great geographical establishment of Perthes in Gotha. This has been enlarged and enriched with great zeal, and is full of the newest and richest materials drawn from the latest explorations and discoveries. We need scarcely add that the "*Unknown*" finds no place in this production of the great map-maker.

The Evangelical Church in Germany is increasing its activity of late in sympathy with the general liberal movements in all fields of thought, and the popular demand is for more light as to the way to counteract the influence and rule of the State Church. In sympathy with this desire we notice occasional works in regard to this very active branch of Protestantism. The latest is that by Aurbach (*Die Evangelische Kirche im Deutschen Reiche.*) the Evangelical Church in the German Empire. The author has evidently the best will and the most earnest intention to advance the interests of the popular Church, as it certainly is, but he finds it very difficult to follow out his principles to their logical consequences. The great German Church needs rebuilding from foundation to summit. It was natural in its first steps for it to copy largely from the official machinery of the *Established* powers, but it has long been able to break away entirely from traditions and customs of an official hierarchy, and it is now the desire of the masses to do so. This would soon be effected if the leaders had more courage, and were bold enough to cut away the bridges behind them. To do this the present author has not the heart —the motto on his title-page is *In omnibus Caritas.*

If the Egyptians of the period took half as much interest in their own matters as do other people, there would soon be a flood of warm sunshine penetrating their barren labors and warming them up to new life and effort. Scarcely a month passes without the appearance of some new treatise on a subject quite different from any that has yet been given us that before long there will be no new worlds to conquer in the matter of Egyptian antiquities. This time it is the Ancient Egyptian Agriculture, by Thaer, *Die alt-aegyptische Landwirthschaft.*) just published in Berlin. The little book gives, in compact form and systematic arrangement, many things taught us by the classical scholars and the monuments concerning the agriculture of the ancient Egyptians. It was

written with a view to inform agriculturists in general in regard to the methods of a people once famous for their agricultural success; but its lively and graphic style, and the excellent plates of ancient monuments illustrating the subject from historical tables of stone, have given it the *entrée* to a higher order of thinkers. Theologians and statesmen may easily find lessons in it—for the former it illustrates and confirms Holy Writ, and for the latter it contains many hints regarding the interests that establish the firmest basis for the prosperity of a nation. Under the rule of Mohammed Ali the first great impulse was given toward a regeneration of agricultural labor in his extensive planting of trees, which has been crowned with effect. Maize thrives in Egypt with proper culture, and might easily be made the standard food of the Fellahs, instead of peas and lentils. The Egyptian wheat of the day is not what it was in the olden time, and some of the *savants* have been trying, unsuccessfully so far, to germinate some of the plump and beautiful seed found with the mummies. Mariette complained that all his efforts had been fruitless, notwithstanding the frequent assertions that this noble grain preserves its vitality through ages.

Professor Schéele, of the University of Upsala, in Sweden, has lately surprised the theological world with an interesting treatise on symbolics that gives some new views regarding the comparison of creeds by this method of study. For some years he has been one of the bright lights of the famous Swedish school, and has conquered attention from his compeers in other lands, notwithstanding the barrier of his tongue, so little studied by the scholars of other countries. A German translation of it is heralded and indorsed by the famous commentator, Doctor Zöckler, whose sign manual to any enterprise is a sufficient guarantee of its worth. With all its learned exactness, however, it does not run the gauntlet of German criticism unscathed. We judge from some of this that the trouble may be partly in the fact that the Swedish scholar leans too strongly toward Lutheranism, a *penchant* not now so popular as in former times. But the fact that Swedish scholars are thus attracting attention is one of interest.

A recent number of the "Russian Review," a monthly journal for the study of Russian affairs, is quite significant in the character of its articles. One of these is on the "Oasis of Achal-Teke," and the means of communication with *India*. Another on the "Hydrometric Measurements on the Amoor Daria, and the climatic relations of Khiva." Still another gives the adventures and studies of a ride through the region of the Anti-Caucasus. . . . We submit that these are very significant subjects to attract the attention of the Russians in a review devoted to Russian affairs; it would indicate that these latter have much interest on the road to *India*.

The Bulletin for the Theological Faculty of Berlin, for its *semester* opening in the middle of October, has just been posted, and it may interest some of our young theologians to have a list of the studies and

teachers for the winter: *Dillmann:* Introduction to the Old Testament; Old Testament History; Exposition of the Psalms.—*Dorner:* Society for Systematic Theology.—*Kleinert:* Exposition of the Book of Job; Homiletics and Catechetics; History of the Constitution of the Evangelical Church.—*Pfleiderer:* Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, and of that to the Galatians. Special Dogmatics.—*Semisch:* Church History; History of Christian Dogmatics.—*Steinmayer:* The Passion of Jesus; System of Practical Theology.—*Weiss:* Exposition of the Epistles to the Corinthians; The Life of Jesus.—*Goltz:* Christian Dogmatics in its Foundation.—*Lommatsch:* Theological Encyclopedia; Christian Symbolics; Society for Dogmatics and Symbolical Theology.—*Messner:* Historical and Critical Introduction to the Writings of the New Testament; Christology of the New Testament.—*Nowack:* Exegesis of Genesis; Exposition of the Poetical Passages in the Historical Books of the Old Testament. Hebrew Exercises.—*Piper:* Sources of Church History; Archæological Criticism and Hermeneutics; Exposition of Biblical History and the Life of Jesus from the Monuments.—*Strack:* Exegesis of the Aramaic Portion of the Book of Daniel, together with an outline of Biblical Aramaics; Hebrew Grammar.—*Butke:* Introduction to the Old Testament; Origin of the Pentateuch.—Docent *Müller:* Church History; History and Doctrine of the Sects now extant in Germany.—*Plath:* General History of Missions; The Christian Church and the English Government in India.—*Ruu:* System of Ethics; History of Philosophical and Christian Ethics.

Art. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

The Old Testament in the Jewish Church. Twelve Lectures on Biblical Criticism. W. Robertson Smith, M.A. Pp. 446. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1881

The case of Professor Smith seems to present a serious ethical question. Is it right for a man to ensconce himself in a theological chair and use his place for the covert inculcation of biblical opinions subversive of the doctrines held by the Church and intended by its founders and authorities to be therein maintained? If it was an editorial chair of a political party, or a medical chair of an allopathic profession, and the incumbent suddenly assailed the political or professional creed of his founders, we know what would be the quiet and unquestioned result. The incumbent would be authoritatively invited to a perpetual vacation. There would be no hue and cry of "persecution;" no blatancies about "bigotry," "intolerance," *et cetera.* Every one would see at once

that an allopathic professor advocating the opposite practice, or a party editor supporting his political opponents, is violating the contract of his occupancy. But the moment a Church acts upon the same obvious principle, namely, that such an officer violates the compact upon which he is selected, then a newspaper rave commences. Bring the question before a judicial court, and we know what the cool application of established principles would decide. But when editors, who on this point seem to have no principles, vociferate against "ecclesiastical tyranny," eulogize the wonderful popularity, learning, and ability of the violator of his obligations, and vilify the maintainers of the right of the Church to decide its own teachings, the Church is abundantly warned to stand deaf to such howlings.

The question will then very properly arise: Are all discussions of the canon to be foreclosed and silenced? Are there to be no free exercises of judgment, however scholarly or candid, upon the sacred records of the Church? That is a fair question. A great advantage would be given to the enemies of truth if they could be really allowed the position of maintainers of free inquiry after the truth of things. And, first, we may answer, that Professor Smith does not occupy the position of an inquirer, but of a dogmatic teacher. In his chair, removed from public audience, he pronounces, or claims right to pronounce, what the truth of biblical science is to listening pupils, who are to accept his *dicta*, to be by them palmed upon the pulpit and the Church. No outside voice must question his *dicta;* for that would be "bigotry," "persecution," "interference with the right of investigation." Regardless of the established opinions of the founders of the chair, and of the long-established principles of the Church, and amenable to no questionings, he is in effect to make his own private opinions by pure force of position the ruling dogma of a large share of the future ministry of the Church. It will at once be seen that the tyranny inheres to the professor and his chair; and that the demand for freedom from illegitimate despotism righly comes from his opponents. It is a fair and honest demand against a bold usurpation. Professor Smith's position and conduct are morally unjustifiable; his Church did right to deal with him; and the clamors of his partisans are demagogism.

Had this book been written by a studious biblical scholar, and laid before the public for free discussions, it might then be a very different case. The ordinary ministrations of his pulpit would

not properly involve their introduction before a popular religious congregation. It would be a book that might claim to be addressed to biblical scientists in the interests of religious truth, perfectly consistent with devout orthodoxy of doctrine, and allowing by its publicity a fair play for free criticism. The rightness of such a course would be greatly clarified by the fact of a discovery of new facts in physical science, in history, in archæology, or in ancient manuscripts. Revolutionary changes both in text and exegesis have been repeatedly effected. New discoveries are made, scholarly discussions are prosecuted, radical changes are adopted, and finally brought into orthodox and popular acceptance. The spurious text of the "three witnesses" was first invalidated by a scholarly comparison of manuscripts; it was then boldly impugned by Churchly scholars; it was next condemned by orthodox commentators; it was thence disused as a proof-text by defenders of the doctrine of the trinity; and finally it was, with a great unanimity, omitted from our new Revised Version. So, also, when geology began to reveal the secrets of the earth's structure, a few sentences from the illustrious Chalmers opened a revolution in our exegesis of the first chapter of Genesis. We are told by those who profess to know that the unanimity among scientists augurs, and will soon compel, a similar revolution in the exegesis of chapter second. Romanism allows Mivart to interpret both chapters by the light of his doctrine of evolution. These revolutionary changes, however, require a fundamental demand, not the needs of a schemer for originality of invention. They must come from a high and well-tried authority, not be imported from Germany by a dapper young gentleman in his overcoat pocket.

At start Professor Smith entirely rejects, it is right to say, the dogma of anti-supernaturalism. He accepts miracle and inspiration. He professes faith in our evangelicism, and expresses his religious impressions in language which, unless we charge him with the use of those double meanings with which "liberalists" love to clothe rationalistic thoughts in evangelistic language, must be accepted as sincere. The Old Testament, however, in his hands, (as successor to his German teachers,) is demolished and reconstructed. In his view the reconstruction leaves undisturbed the experience and theology of the evangelical Church. It might be hoped that his reconstruction changes only the arrangement of parts, and leaves the entire canon an unbroken whole. But his whole strain diminishes

the authority of the proofs on which the canon stands, the certainty of the text, and the validity of the selection of the books. The authority of the Jewish Church is reduced to a *nihil*, and the authority of Christ and the apostolic Church is ignored. Isaiah is sawn asunder; Daniel is shut into Apocrypha; Canticles and Esther are abolished; all which seems a consistent finish of the process by which the Pentateuch is dismembered at the beginning, and leaves us from the generous professor's hands a battered, shattered, tattered, fragment of our Old Testament. We are thankful at being assured that the final fragments are a most precious lot of chips. The prophets were eloquent preachers, sustaining a high spirituality, and "have more of Christ in them than the Levitical Law." Whether any predictions of Christ are in them or not (as Jesus supposed there were in Daniel) is not said.

The professor's demolition begins with Genesis and Exodus. He is an implicit believer in the questionable theory that those books are made up of a junction of documents distinguishable by the names of Jehovah and Elohim. But as this distinction rules also in Joshua and Judges, so the composition of Genesis and Exodus could be no earlier than the time of the Judges. We are at once relieved from trouble about any Mosaic cosmogony or Edenic fall of man.

In the Pentateuch he finds three distinct Legislations made at very different epochs of Hebrew history. The *First* or *Wilderness Legislation* is found in Exod. xxi–xxiii. These three brief chapters, destitute of all ritual directions, are simply the code of secular law for a simple, primitive, Oriental people. This is all of Moses' real Law. The *Second or Deuteronomic Legislation* is found in the Book of Deuteronomy, and first appeared in the time of Josiah; being the *Law* found in the temple, and read in that monarch's hearing with a great reformatory effect. Author unknown. The *Third or Levitical Legislation*, comprised in the Books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, first appeared in the time of Ezra, was designed to segregate Israel more exclusively from surrounding religions, and was a ritual code for the nation as a Church. That we do not know the authors of these Legislations the professor holds to have no influence on the question of their authority or canonicity. But Moses seems reduced to a *minimum*, if not to a myth.

This non-existence of the Levitical Law before the time of Ezra relies for proof on the historic disregard by the Israelites of

its prescriptions during all the previous time, and the actual practice, even by devout Hebrews, of contrary rites. So uniform a disuse of Leviticism proves the non-existence of its code. In detail his arguments from this disuse are admirably anticipated, and nearly all refuted, in Dr. Harman's INTRODUCTION. As to the matter of disuse in total, it is patent on the face of Israel's national history, and, indeed, forms its very structure, that this neglect of the law did take place; that it constituted Israel's great apostasy; and that for it he was swept from his land, his temple demolished, and his people cast into captivity. This very neglect of Leviticus, which disconcerts poor Mr. Smith, is key to Israel's history. Israel's first downfall was for his rejection of Moses; his second for his rejection of Christ.

The lectures are written in a mild and amiable spirit, in a clear and rather pleasing style, and in a lucid but not very forcible logic. Whether the lecturer's erudition is great, as his admirers claim, there is nothing to decide; but he has studied his theme, of course, however one-sidedly, with great thoroughness. His book suggests a field of research for our biblical scholars; but it opens no epoch, it will work no revolution, it will never stand as a standard. Its whole theory is but one of the countless ephemeral mist-structures formed by the exhalations rising from the neological swamp.

The Theistic Argument as Affected by Recent Theories. A Course of Lectures delivered at the Lowell Institute, in Boston, by J. LEWIS DIMAN, D.D., late Professor of History and Political Economy in Brown University. 8vo, pp. [illegible]. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Riverside Press, Cambridge. 1881.

These Lectures indicate that in the decease of the author, in 1881, Christian philosophy lost an able expositor. Dr. Diman was a distinguished professor in Brown University, whose philosophical education had been completed in Germany, under the instruction of such masters as Julius Müller, Rothe, Erdmann, Ulrici, and Trendelenburg. These Lectures were delivered in course at the Lowell Institute in 1880. The eminent scholar found no difficulty in adjusting his style to his popular audience. Avoiding the schoolman's technics, and adopting a free, fresh, flowing diction, he has not failed to give a popular clearness and a fine grace to even the most recondite parts of his subject. An invariable candor and courtesy toward his opponents reign throughout. He is naturally diffuse and copious, but often lacking a terse force at the pinch of the argument, and seldom summarizing the conclusion in comprehensive aphorism.

In his first two Lectures he surveys the field, and discusses the relativity of our knowledge, in which he concludes that the limitations of our faculties, rigid as they are, allow us to attain the knowledge of a basal Absolute. His next Lecture ascertains that this Absolute is truly primordial *Cause*, even though thus far in the argument we have not attained complete Deity. Thence contemplating the general Order of the cosmical arrangements we attain, as based upon this Absolute, the conception of Law. Passing from Law as reigning in the organic Cosmos, to Law and combinations of Law in the minuter details of biology, we attain Design. This argument, he next asserts, in an extended lecture, is rather re-enforced than enfeebled by the doctrine of evolution. God as ruling in human history, and God as endowed with personality and infinity, with a final deduction of inferences from theism, complete the argument and the series. We may now touch some special points of criticism.

In the second Lecture it is conceded, as is generally done by metaphysicians, that Hume's professed reduction of *soul* to a series of thoughts brings in complete skepticism, that is, as to the reality and immortality of the soul. Let us query. It would be well, if possible, at this point to checkmate skepticism. *A series may be as persistent as an entity.* If that series of thoughts is persistent and consistent through eighty years of one's life, it may be persistent and consistent eighty millions of years. A thread of continuity may be as endless as the permanence of a substance. If, as Hume maintains, the world is an ideal system moving on in endless order, why may not an ego be also an ideal series moving on in endless order? If matter is an ideal indestructible entity, why not thought an indestructible line of continuity? The ideal earth through all the past geological eternity has been a continuous ideal persistence, and so will be in the future; what more wonderful, then, would be the eternal persistence of the ideal ego? We should, however, use this argument simply as a rebuttal of the skeptic, not in approval of the reduction of soul to serial thought. The mind, we hold, does intuitively attach the series of thought to a subject entity, a conscious Ego. That Ego is localized by consciousness in our organism, but not identified with any spot or part of the organism.

The agnostic philosophers of the present day, as Herbert Spencer, affirm that the human mind cannot attribute *intelligence, personality*, to an infinite Being. The two ideas, personality and infinity, are so incompatible that thought cannot combine them

in unity. Now, we would like to see that affirmation brought to a closer issue and a manly repudiation. It is a question of psychological *fact*, to be decided by consciousness, and to our own consciousness is the appeal to be made. When, then, for instance, Mr. Spencer tells us that *he* cannot combine the two thoughts in the same subject we, of course, in courtesy concede him the mental impotence he claims. But when he grows aggressive, and tells me that I cannot, I am entitled to reply that I know by the conclusive evidence of consciousness that affirmation to be a falsity. I can, without the slightest mental difficulty, think the conception of an infinite, perfectly powerful, and perfectly wise, ONE. I can think it much more perfectly than I can most finites; as, for instance, such a finite being as Mr. Spencer himself, especially such a Spencer as he here presents himself, a man of great intellect who cannot conceive of an intelligent Omnipotent. Such a divine conception we psychologically possessed for many years before we ever thought out this eminent philosopher; and we cannot now be persuaded that our mind is truly vacant of that composite idea. And, next, having answered for ourself individually, we hesitate not to appeal to our readers or our hearers for the testimony of their consciousness. Can you not conceive the unity of an infinite Being, perfectly potent and perfectly sapient, just as easily as you can conceive an ocean extending from pole to pole, or a luminiferous ether bathing the worlds in light, or a gravitation holding the spheres in harmonies roll? And, then, extending the range of our interrogation, we ask the Christendom of eighteen centuries: Have you the conception of an infinite, all-wise, omnipotent God? We put the question to an older Judaism and to a younger Mohammedanism, and from this whole wide jury of the human intellect we know what responsive verdict we obtain. It is, then, too late in the day for our accomplished philosopher to tell us that an all-wise Omnipotent is "unthinkable" by the human mind. The statement is historically a falsehood, philosophically a "pseud-idea."

In his chapter on *Personality and the Infinite* the professor aims to connect and endow the Deity, thus far evinced by the design argument, with absolute infinity. This aim is, we think, rather in the interest of metaphysics than of religion. Practically we need trouble our faith with the question, whether the God whose wisdom reigns through the known universe is metaphysically infinite, as little as the astronomer troubles himself with the question whether gravitation extends its lines to a

metaphysically infinite length. Nor do we see that Prof. Diman attains a metaphysical certainty on that point. The most that we can say is, that if these metaphysical attributes have a true validity and belong to some being, there is no other known candidate for that crown than the Deity of the design argument. The nomination of any other aspirant is illegitimate.

The refusal of Herbert Spencer to attribute intelligence to his Unknown Absolute, his substitute for God, is also answered by Diman, clearly, if not trenchantly. Spencer admits that his *Unknown* is truly *known* as cause and ground of the universe; a universe whose objective character very much resembles a product of mind. This refusal of intelligence to such a cause of such a product looks much like a voluntary perverseness. Nor is that look much relieved by the pretext assigned by Spencer for his refusal. His pretext is the fact that there may be attributes immensely transcending intelligence inconceivable to us. But if to us inconceivable they cannot legitimately come into our reasoning, for "thinkability" is a fundamental test with Mr. Spencer of the validity of a conception; the unthinkable is the non-existent. And justly here: for a man might as well say that a mathematical square is not square because there may be an unthinkable square infinitely squarer. Again, if there is a higher and a lower in attributes, why does the possibility of a higher exclude or render questionable the existence of a lower? Why may not both co-exist? Again, the withdrawal of intelligence, intelligence of the most transcendent character, leaves an irreparably maimed conception, destroying its claim as an "Absolute." Whatever its other attributes, if it knows neither itself nor any thing else, if it can never act with intelligence, the greater its being the greater its monstrosity. It has no claim to existence, and its very conception should be precipitated out of human thought.

The closing chapter, *Inferences from Theism*, should, we think, have presented some definite and impressive Christian views of the belief in God. We wish our eloquent professor, without violating that courtesy which he so finely maintains toward opponents throughout his volume, had called to attention the fact that theism is not only an intellective but a moral and profoundly religious question, involving something more of responsibility than does the question of the nature of the comet or the plutonic theory of the earth. How eloquently could he have pictured the desolateness of the spirit vacant of the divine Idea, the fearfulness of the probability that an atheistic creed, being the result of a god-

less heart, has within it an infinite danger; and how completely the impossibility of prayer for an atheistic soul leaves it without all remedy or rescue. And when he tells so well how little men are theists from the arguments he has presented, why does he omit to tell us whence comes the cap-stone and crown of all our theistic argument? Men do believe in God from the design argument but feebly, justly conclusive as it is. Why? Just because, since it is not only an intellective but a spiritual question, the intellective proof furnishes the intellective conviction, but not the true spiritual REALIZATION of God. That, the demonstration of the Spirit, the truly *knowing* God, comes only from profound religious experience. The human spirit that communes with God *realizes* the divine presence, and truly knows God. The great argument is then finished and crowned, and the undoubting soul rests in perfect peace. Hence it is from our estrangement of the heart from God that springs all doubt of the existence of God. Atheism is, therefore, included in the very body of human sin, the very body of death.

Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. Prepared by Rev. JOHN M'CLINTOCK, D.D., and JAMES STRONG, S.T.D. Vol. X, S–Z. Quarto, pp. 1120. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

We congratulate Dr. Strong on the completion of his big Alphabet. It is a *monumentum ære*, etc. The present volume, with its able articles and plentiful and pertinent illustrations, is at least equal to any of its predecessors. We are gratified to see the announcement that there is to be added a supplement volume. And that will have to be supplemented by another, and so on; so that the good doctor's work will always be "being done," but never "having been done." Thereby comes into existence a new sort of periodical, indicating that no department of thought is more alive and "progressing" than biblical and theological science.

Among the articles we specially note those on the Talmud and the Targums, by Dr. Benard Pick, of Rochester. The articles on Unitarianism and Universalism are contributed by eminent ministers of those denominations. Valuable articles by the editor are Tabernacle, Temple, Council of Trent, Wesley and Wesleyanism, and Wines. Upon the doctrine of the human Will, the editor has impartially selected an Arminian and a Calvinistic writer to present the opposite sides of freedom and necessity, namely, Dr. Raymond and Dr. A. A. Hodge, a selection very satisfactory to all parties.

Our limits permit but a few notes on Dr. Hodge's Article. He objects, himself, to Edwards, (quoting Dr. Smith,) as making Will too mechanically caused by antecedents; but, nevertheless, neither Dr. S. nor Dr. H. get one hair beyond Edwards; all denying that there is any adequate power to choose otherwise than the given choice, and so giving us nothing more than the freedom of the clock-hammer to strike no otherwise than it does strike. Their freedom is simply clock-hammer freedom; they never with all their struggles and wriggles get beyond *clock-hammerism*. And on this vital point they are all exactly identical and one. Dr. H. quotes Calvin as acknowledging a will that "determines itself by itself;" but without adding "with power to determine itself by itself," in any other than one given direction; so that we are still in *clock-hammerism*. For a clock-hammer "determines itself by itself" in one solely possible direction. Dr. H. assures us that Edwards' argument of the Infinite series (against the Arminian self-determining power) is triumphant; then, we reply, Edwards triumphantly proved that there is no self-determining power that can self-determine any other than one sole way, which is again clock-hammer self-determination. Again, Dr. H. tells us that Edwards never intended to deny that freedom of choice which is witnessed for in conscience; but, we answer, he did intend to deny all freedom for other than a given choice, as truly as he denied that a clock-hammer can strike any other than a given stroke. So that Edwards did deny, and did intend to deny, that very freedom of choice which actually and truly is witnessed for in conscience; and so does Dr. Hodge. The difference between the necessitation of the clock stroke and of the volition is, that the former is physical and the latter is psychological; but the absoluteness of the necessitation and exclusion of all responsible freedom is in both equal and one. The one is physical and the other psychological *clock-hammerism*. Universally, volitional necessitation is *clock-hammerism*, and should go by that name. And this clock-hammerism can be no more reconciled with the moral sense than a mathematical axiom can be erased from the human mind. Dr. H. condemns our volume on the Will for not investigating it as a purely psychological and not as a theological question. Isaac Taylor censured Edwards (as Dr. H. also does) for the same thing. But is not the criticism absurd? Does Dr. H. affirm that the Will is not to be analyzed in its theological bearings, as well as in its psychological nature? The title of our volume is: *The Freedom of the Will, as a Basis of*

Human Responsibility and a Divine Government, Elucidated and Maintained, etc. Now is it not perfectly legitimate for a thinker to discuss human volitional freedom in its relation to the divine government? In our treatment, the "Psychological Argument" and the "Theological Argument" are each discussed in separate full sections, and the mutual bearings attempted to be adjusted; which we submit is the right treatment of a legitimate subject.

The Editor's Article on *Wines* is a valuable summary, and yet seems to us a little one-sided. As to Γλεῦκος, the new wine of Acts ii, 13, he doubts whether it is ever called *wine*, and also whether it intoxicates. But Aristotle, a decisive authority, is quoted by Dr. Samson as saying, "There is a certain *wine*, the unfermented *gleukos*, which may both be congealed and evaporated." Again, of the sweet wine or glukos, Aristotle says, "In name, indeed, it is wine, but not in operation, first its taste is not wine-like; again, for this reason that it does not intoxicate." It seems that this article should acknowledge that there was a wine, customarily used, which did not intoxicate. There are ample other proofs which we think are not duly noticed. Dr. S. admits that there is "no positive proof" that the eucharistic wine was alcoholic. But he believes it was alcoholic on authority of the Rabbies in the Mishna. But when we remember that the Jews almost universally use not fermented wine but raisin water at Passover in spite of the Rabbies, how is it possible that Jesus, with whom Rabbinical tradition (for Scripture does not command wine at all at Passover) was no favorite, should obey the Rabbinical rule? If the Passover did not allow fermented bread, much less should it admit fermented wine. Even many pagans had scruples about offering fermented wine to their purer gods.

Faith, Doubt, and Evidence. God's Vouchers for His Written Word, with Critical Illustrations from the Autobiography of Dr. Franklin. By Rev. Geo. B. Cheever, D.D. 12mo, pp. 313. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. Price, $1 50.

Ever since the day of Deacon Giles and his distillery, Dr. Cheever has been known as a vigorous and individualistic thinker and writer. He is what he is intensely, as antislavery, anti-intemperance, evangelistic champion; as a Puritan of the Puritans, and a most stalwart defender of the sacred canon.

The nucleus of the present volume is, as the title shows, a parallelism between the MSS. of "Franklin's Memoirs" and some of the New Testament documents. Franklin, before printing,

gave a machine-made copy of his manuscript "Memoirs" to a French friend, which was in due time mostly translated into French and published, being the first publication of the work. It was then translated back into English, which became the second publication—a translation of a French translation. On Franklin's death his autograph descended to his grandson, William Temple Franklin, who went to London to edit its publication. But, instead of printing the autograph itself, Temple Franklin, in order, doubtless, to prevent the precious original from being soiled in the printing, exchanged it off with the French friend for the loaned copy; so that the loaned copy was thus far the source of all the publications. To make matters worse, Temple Franklin made a large amount of modifications according to his own taste, so that it became, in some degree, a spurious Memoir. What became of the original autograph? It descended through the heirs of the French proprietor until a few years since it fell into the hands of our French Minister, Mr. Bigelow. By him it has for the first time been published with all the thorough care of a competent editor.

But the novel point remains to be told. Mr. Bigelow finds in the autograph eight concluding pages which are omitted from all the previous publications! They form, in most respects, the most important part of the Memoir, as narrating the most brilliant points of Franklin's career. Yet they were not in the machine copy; and hence are wanting in all the publications before Mr. Bigelow's. Even William Temple Franklin himself was ignorant of their existence! Dr. Cheever uses these curious facts to illustrate the omission in the majority of manuscripts of the conclusion of Mark's Gospel. In Mark's case the abrupt ending in the midst of a transaction strongly demonstrates that the ending is omitted. Irenæus, who quotes the missing *ending*, is a witness that it existed in very early copies. And Franklin's case shows how the multiplication of copies without the ending does not disprove its existence in the earliest copies, or even in the autograph. Mr. Bigelow here, in a degree, represents Irenæus, having in hand the autograph as Irenæus had the early copy, both nullifying the vast majority of copies with the omission.

Appended to this nucleus, and more or less connected with the subject, Dr. C. gives us critical notes on the genuine text, with a large amount of trenchant *miscellanea*, advocating the high authority of the sacred oracles.

Hours with the Bible; or, Scriptures in the Light of Modern Discovery and Knowledge. By CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE, D.D., author of "The Life and Words of Christ." Vol. II., From Moses to the Judges. With Illustrations. 12mo, pp. 520. New York: James Pott. 1881.

Dr. Geikie's second volume leads us through some of the most difficult parts of the Old Testament, spreading illustration on both sides the onward path. Sixteen chapters preparing with Goshen, Egypt before the sojourn, the oppression in Egypt, and Moses; and moving on with the Exodus, Sinai, the wilderness, and the law; finish with the conquest of Canaan, the settlement, and age of the Judges, until the era of Samson. The twenty-one engravings do not much ornament the book, but do somewhat illustrate the subjects. The revelations of modern research brought to illumine Israel's history are marvelously new and affluent. The wonderful exactness with which the Mosaic narrative dovetails in with Egyptian discovery leaves no excuse for skepticism. Unquestionably true, we now know, were the pens that traced those old events. The volume will not, of course, afford the textual criticism of a commentary, and so could not fill its place, but it presents and illustrates the consecutive history more connectedly and luminously than any textual commentary can. Hence both Dr. Geikie's volumes may be recommended as the latest and best extant historical accompaniment of text and commentary for the biblical student.

The Resurrection Life; or, "Beyond the Grave" Examined. By Rev. I. VILLARS, of the Illinois Conference, Methodist Episcopal Church. 12mo, pp. 426. Cincinnati: Printed by Walden & Stowe for the author. 1881.

Mr. Villars here furnishes an extended and elaborate view of Bishop Foster's well-known work, and maintains the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. We do not say *the* "literal" *resurrection of the body;* for a resurrection that is not a literal resurrection is for a theology which states literal truth no resurrection at all. Mr. Villars finds at first, that the Bishop's statements of his conclusions are a little indecisive, and so gives an extended *resumé* of the book by Dr. Curry, which brings the matter to a more explicit point. Whether the Bishop ought to be made responsible for the respected doctor's statements is a little doubtful. But even this quotation from Dr. C. is far from completely giving its author's complete view. If we rightly recollect, his view, elsewhere stated, is that *the resurrection of the body* is the ascent of the soul from Hades to the heavenly state. We think this view is defective in two respects: for, first, there is no *body* in the

case, and, second, no *resurrection*. For surely the soul is not the body, and the soul's going up from Hades to paradise is no more a resurrection than a man's going up stairs to a higher room is a resurrection.

History, Biography, and Topography.

The Problem of Religious Progress. By DANIEL DORCHESTER, D.D. 12mo, pp. 603. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1881.

So loud and general are the boasts of infidels, rationalists, free-thinkers, and no-thinkers, that Christianity is on the wane, and fast reaching its vanishing point, that Dr. Dorchester has concluded to bring them to the decisive test of arithmetic and statistics. Theodore Parker, though claiming nominally to be a Christian minister, yet declared that Christianity is dying, and wondered that Christians cannot see it. The brave Colonel Ingersoll, in his attack on Christianity, quoted from the "North American" on another page, opens battle with a shout of death to his victim. And it is a general assumption with a large share of the secular press at the present time that "the orthodoxy of the day" is obsolete, that it is not believed by its preachers, and that it is to fade before the clear light of science, atheism, and nothingism. During the last winter a Congregationalist minister of Brooklyn resigned his pulpit and seceded into rationalism, and the "Brooklyn Eagle," a leading democratic paper, abounding in ability and recklessness, had the impudent mendacity to declare that if all the ministers of Brooklyn who did not believe what they preached should retire, the Brooklyn pulpits would be mostly empty. We think, therefore, with Dr. Dorchester, that it is time such calumniators should be taught a lesson in arithmetic, so that in prosecuting such talk in the future it should be made clear that they are direct, conscious, and responsible falsifiers.

Our author opens with a recapitulation of the boasts and braggartisms of some responsible spokesmen, namely, of Bishop Hughes and Rev. Mr. Ewer, prophesying the downfall of Protestantism, and of Buckle, the "Atlantic Monthly," and Goldwin Smith in behalf of rationalism, predicting the abolition of Christian faith. There would be no difficulty in a brief period of making a volume of such assumptions from the periodicals of the day, that at least the present form of faith was rapidly disintegrating and ready to vanish away.

Now, first, in three leading chapters, headed FAITH, MORALS,

and Spiritual Vitality, Dr. Dorchester shows by a clear survey that faith in our central doctrines was never more firm, that Christian morals had never before so purified and elevated the age, and that Spiritual Vitality was never so energetic, so active, so all-pervading, and so all-conquering as at the present hour. As a *survey* all this might be contested but for a fourth chapter of Statistical Exhibits, which forms the whole argument into an arithmetical demonstration, leaving no room for doubt.

He begins with Romanism, and portrays its rapid decline from circumference to center in nearly all parts of the world. It once had a large share of North America, but has lost its hold forever, and is fading in South America. In Europe the papacy is losing its grasp over the governments, the populations are passing from Papal to Protestant, the intolerance of the Romish nations is breaking up, and Protestantism is building her churches in the precincts of the Vatican. In America, Romanism's gains are mostly from immigration, and these gains are made at a terrible loss of millions in the transfer. Yet, with all these helps, which are temporary as well as costly, Romanism does not advance as rapidly as the population, and is overwhelmingly distanced in progress by the evangelical denominations. It seems to be arithmetically certain that Romanism has about attained her growth in America; and that, hereafter, her history is to be resistless decline. As to the "Liberal" Christians, the disbelievers in the "Trinitarian and sacrificial theology," their history is a monitory lesson. From them, either organized or unorganized, comes the boast that Christianity, or "orthodoxy," is to yield to some new form of faith. And yet *their own history is abortion!* If they stay unorganized, undefined, as no religion at all, but as a chaotic body of "nothingarians," they can keep up a clangor of half philosophical and half declamatory opposition to Christianity as it is, and serve the cause of immorality and vice a great deal more than they intend. For very plainly, it is the very religion they oppose that possesses the aggressive and conquering power. The semi-religion of Unitarianism and Liberalism has, as religion, no vital energy; its main essence is doubt; it disintegrates in its organisms, and is ever likely to melt into pantheism or merge into atheism. Young Unitarianism sprung up in Boston, proud of its talents, wealth, and rank, with a Channing for its leader, and Harvard for its captured stronghold, and it gracefully promised to take the country and the age. What and where is it now? A congeries of rationalism, pantheism, atheism, and

all sorts of negativism. An inert, shapeless, but highly conceited thing. Missions? How should they, who do not know what themselves believe, organize for the conversion of others? Churches? They are diminished and diminishing in number. Congregations? They have nearly gone over to the "orthodox." That is the plain sum total of Dr. Dorchester's figures.

The conclusive power of these figures can be fully felt only by perusal in detail, or carefully noting a number of totalized conclusions. But with peculiar skill, the author has summarized them in a few interesting diagrams, of which each contains a volume in itself. One diagram exhibits the growth of Christianity since the year *one*, and finds that by far its most stupendous growth has occurred since A. D. 1800. Another pictures the comparative growth of Romanism, Greek Church, and Protestantism, and shows that Protestantism equaled Romanism in 1800, and has made a most surpassing spring of superiority since 1830. The diagrammic breadth of Protestantism is in 1876 more than twice that of Romanism. And not only the gains, but the forces for future gains, are rapidly going over to Protestant Christianity, and in Protestant Christianity to Evangelical Christianity. If there is to be any religion at all in the future, that religion is to be *the holy Trinitarian sacrificial religion of Protestant Christianity*. That alone is gaining, relatively, absolutely, and rapidly. It gains over all rivals; it gains over the increase of population, and, judging the future by the present, it will gain all the nations of the earth.

There is a wonderful energizing life in these demonstrations. No minister, no reflecting Christian layman, can contemplate them without feeling a fresh spring of hope and strength within him. The book should be studied by both, and the boast of the enemy should be thoroughly encountered, defeated, and silenced. We have no doubt the volume will make a profound impression in Europe as well as in America.

Madame De Staël. A Story of her Life and Times. The First Revolution and the First Empire. By Abel Stevens, LL.D. In Two Volumes. Vol. I, pp. 367; Vol. II, pp. 373. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1881.

Dr. Stevens appears as an admirable master in the field of secular history. The same fascination of style and power of delineating character, of picturing scenes and narrating events, exhibited in his churchly volumes, reign through these exhilarating pages. With a rare industry, born of a love of his subject,

he has collected the varied traces of Madame De Staël's character scattered through literature, and brought them into a coherent picture. Hence she appears truly a much greater personage than her past diffusive reputation has indicated. And to those who imagine that Dr. Stevens eulogizes his heroine in too diffusive and lofty a strain it may be replied that the large share of the apparent hyperbole is in the language of her contemporaries, whose supposed extravagances were inspired by an acquaintance with the living subject. The whole group of characters which she centralizes belongs, we might dream, to a higher order of humanity, and there is much that is elevating in being for a while, even in narrative, in their society. The most testing point of Madame De Staël's innate nobleness appears in her heroic self-abandonment in rescuing her friends from the Parisian mobs during the bloody days of their power. How boldly did she rush into a hair-breadth of death, thoughtless of herself, agonized for the safety of others! How nobly she moves at Coppet amid her rescued friends! Her unpurchasable heroism in resisting the power of Napoleon when she clearly saw that he was in purpose a Cæsar rather than a Washington, constitutes a great claim upon our admiration. And her firm and eloquent maintenance of Christian faith, on the lofty grounds of immortality, right, holiness, God, as realities consonant with the highest intuitions of the human soul, furnishes us an inspiring lesson.

Perhaps it is asking too much of Madame De Staël that after spending the heroic vitality of her whole past life in opposing the bastard despotism of Napoleon, she should not finally succumb to the "legitimate" despotism of Alexander of Russia and his allied victors. She received with loyalty and gratitude the visit of the czar at Coppet; and there appears no protest or remonstrance on her part against the attempted restoration of absolutism. That was left to Brougham and his Whig compeers of England, who made Europe ring with denunciations of the knot of royal conspirators who, under the blasphemous epithet of "Holy Alliance," aimed to stamp out the rights of humanity. In due time they marched their armies into Spain and crushed the constitutional government of that country; and they were preparing to send their fleets across the ocean to reduce the South American republics to the rule of Spain, when a few sentences in the Annual Message of President Monroe warned them back to their own shores, and inflicted a wholesome paralysis upon their royal corporeities. We expect a full review of these volumes.

Sermons by the late Rev. David Seth Doggett, D.D., one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, with a Biographical Sketch of the Author. By Rev. John E. Edwards, D.D. Edited by THOMAS O. SUMMERS, D.D., LL.D Vol. I. 12mo, pp. 407. Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Methodist Publishing House. 1881.

From our first intellectual acquaintance with Dr. Doggett—and we had no personal—as Editor of the "Southern Quarterly" at Richmond, we recognized the impress of a refined and elevated character. We could readily have presupposed the fine description here given, that "he was an unusually handsome and courtly man, in port and *physique*. His complexion was bright and ruddy, his features delicately chiseled, his eye a lustrous blue, and his hand and head a model for a sculptor. As a public speaker, he had a finely modulated voice, with striking facial expression and graceful gesture—all of which was rendered doubly effective by the genuine and unaffected goodness that beamed in every feature, and shone out so conspicuously in every utterance of his lips." By personal endowments, bodily and mental, he was spontaneously a natural orator, and by grace and nature a model Methodist preacher. His versatility is conspicuous from the flexible ease and success with which he was master at camp-meeting, in the metropolitan pulpit, in the college chaplaincy, in the editorial sanctum, and in the episcopal chair.

Of course, in reading sermons we strive in vain to supply the person and delivery of the orator himself. It is plain that he did not win popularity by any airy neglect of scriptural or theological truth. His sermons are true sermons, admirable analyses, and animated statements of Bible doctrine. He is not in a high degree ornate or pictorial, though his description of the flood and some other passages show ample possession of descriptive power. His sentences are clean cut and classical; his paragraphs often rise into eloquence, but never soar into bombast. We read with special interest his life-like portraiture of Bishop Early, whose stalwart form we remember sitting with the Virginia delegation, as we gazed in our young manhood down upon him from the gallery of the General Conference of 1844.

But the crowning excellence of Dr. Doggett's sermons was that they were no mere eloquent orations, but effective appeals; thrilling congregations, arousing revivals, and gathering prosperous accessions to the Church of God. In better times his reputation and influence would have been not provincial, but national, as a complete and princely man. As it is he belongs as a gem to the universal Church.

Politics, Law, and General Morals.

The "Spoils" System and Civil-Service Reform in the Custom-house and Post-office at New York. By DORMAN B. EATON. 12mo, pp. 123. New York: Published for the Civil-service Reform Association, by G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1881.

The Beginning of the "Spoils" System in the National Government, 1829–30. (Reprinted by permission from Parton's "Life of Andrew Jackson.") 12mo, pp. 23. New York: Published for the Civil-service Reform Association. By G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1881.

True American freedom must be maintained by perpetual battles against the successive despotisms, which accumulate and rule from epoch to epoch. First came the *slavocracy,* the overthrow of which cost us thousands of lives and billions of debt. That work is about done; since even its bravest supporters are beginning to tell us they do not desire its restoration. Three more despotisms are now standing in row before us for a similar though bloodless fate. The first let us call the *demagocracy,* or oligarchy of trading politicians; the second is the *rumocracy,* or oligarchy of alcoholic traders and drinkers; the third is the *plutocracy,* or moneyed and especially railroad monopoly.

The *demagocracy,* (an uncouth term for a very uncouth thing,) first in this row of fated destiny, against which the *Civil-service Reform Association* is forming its ranks, is happily the easiest to overcome; and when overcome, the victory over its fellow despotisms will be the more easily accomplished. When our politics are purified, when they become less polluted with mercenary motives, and the minds of men are turned from questions of booty and spoils to principles and public measures, high moral, as well as economical, questions can be brought before the decision of the ballot. Our elections, instead of great moral dangers and depreciations, may become great self-regenerating processes. The ballot will acquire new dignity, power, and glory. It will be the expression of a high and ever rising public sentiment. Our government will feel its ennobling effect, and become less sordid, selfish, violent, and regardless of all high moral interests.

And when our elections become more clearly decisions upon moral and economical questions a temperance platform may be laid, and a contest waged without producing a reaction which places the extreme rum party in power. And then our deep thinkers will study out the methods by which the extremes of human condition can be in some degree lessened; by which the rich may become less rich and the poor less poor, and the number of both millionaires and paupers become comparatively fewer.

As it is now, our rail kings are becoming the true successors of the cotton kings. They have bound us all in fetters of iron. And the maxim of imposing rates in proportion "as the business can bear" enables them to "tax without representation" more despotically than ever the King of England claimed to do over his American colonies.

The method of the Civil-service Reformers is most legitimate. It is an organization to spread the truth and keep it before the public mind. Its purpose is to reveal to our eyes the baseness of the oligarchy which rules and degrades us, to expose its history, its methods, and its destructive tendencies, and to point out the mode by which its whole system may be abolished. That this execrable system can be abolished is fully proved by the example of England, which has gone through the process of reform successfully, as Mr. Dorman B. Eaton has amply shown in his valuable "History of the English Reform," noticed by us in a former Quarterly. It is to arouse the good men of all parties to the need of reform by presenting the facts. And when the public mind is roused to the determined point, it is wonderful with what spontaneity our public men will fall into line, emulous to show that *they* are true Civil-service Reformers. Let the great body of citizens, not belonging to the *demagocracy*, speak with unanimity and decision, and the gang of public thieves will disperse or come quite expeditiously to order.

Offices under governments are either political proper, as dealing directly with governmental policies, as cabinet or congressional positions; or they may be merely clerical or mechanical, as clerkships, postmasterships, etc., the duties of which are the same whatever policies are adopted. It is in the latter class, where mere expertness in a duty is required, that political opinions are not to be taken into account, but solely fitness for the routine work. Thereby the main body of the vast armies of hired retainers no longer exists. Our presidential elections may cease to be great crises of danger in which a hundred thousand office-holders and a million of office-seekers are arrayed in national contest for the "spoils" of victory.

Of the beginning and growth of this oligarchy Mr. Eaton and Mr. Parton, in the above tracts, give a very readable history. Its fitting founder was Aaron Burr. And his successors in the line of infamy were Martin Van Buren, Andrew Jackson, and William L. Marcy. It consisted in organizing either the party, or a faction in the party, into a sort of feudal system. A chief boss was to be at

the head; secondary bosses surrounded and sustained his throne, and a tertiary stratum of bosses underlay them, until the power of the central bossism extended down to the lowest dregs of the whisky saloon and the gutter. Powerful we know is organization. This well-trained organism would as easily overrule the non-political citizenship as Cortes' phalanxes could subdue the sporadic Mexicans. Each lower stratum was fastened under the upper layer by sordid self-interests. It was bound to its masters by bribes in the form of official salaries, gifts, treats and steals; or by the fascinating hope of salaries, gifts, treats and steals. The system was easily self-perpetuating; and, victoriously used by one party, it had to be adopted by the other party; so that the simple citizen proper had his choice between opposite demagogeracies. The effect on our public men has been disastrous. We still have statesmen; some in public life, and immensely more in private life. But our public men have great temptations not to be statesmen. Our indictment against Mr. Conkling is that, with the greatest power of being a statesman, he has resolutely refused, and determined to be a place politician. He refused to rise into the character of a great expositor of principles and national policies, trusting to his high statesmanly qualities for appreciation and honor; and has preferred to mouse among stipendiaries, to win support by bargains and cabals. Profoundly we sorrowed over his self-degradation and were compelled to rejoice over his political downfall. It showed how great was Mr. Conkling's power when he could for long weeks hold the American Senate dead-locked; and it showed his profound want of moral sensibilities, when he could stand before the American people during those weeks, demanding that the New York Custom-house, a national and not a State institution, should be put into his pocket as a fund to bind his retainers to his own person by the bribe of salaried stipends.

Yet the greatest danger from this venal system was during the Tweed dynasty. So firmly compacted was the venal gang under that "statesman," so completely bound hand and foot was the entire general body politic, that when his robberies were laid fully before the public, the great model Boss could defiantly respond, "And what are you going to do about it?" Happy it was that he found out by quick experience what could be done. For there can be no doubt that the purpose existed to transfer Tweedism from New York to Washington. The Boss and his gang were in a fair way to draw upon the New York tax-payers

for the funds to place a great democratic Boss in the Presidential chair, where, on his liberal system, the Nation might be robbed as profusely and defiantly as the city had been.

Civil-service Reform, as we have before remarked, though a political, is not a partisan question. It is a *moralizing* movement, and belongs alike to the private citizen, the press, and even the pulpit. The startling events of the past few months have given a new power to the movement; and the organs of public sentiment should allow the question to "sleep no more." If President Garfield survive the bloody assault which a fitting representative of the system has made upon his life, we rejoice to know that he is abundantly on record in behalf of this reform. Among his many utterances we can select but one: "To reform this service is one of the highest and most imperative duties of statesmanship."

In the line of contributors to the cause of the Reform came first Presidents Grant and Hayes, both of whom gave strong testimonials, and initiated measures which were largely defeated by an obstructive Congress elected on the "plunder" system. Great are the services of George W. Curtis to this Reform. Senator Pendleton, on the Democratic side, has introduced a bill instituting and maintaining competitive examinations, and Mr. Willis, of Kentucky, a bill prohibiting the levy of assessments upon office holders. Thus support comes from both parties and both sections. Both these measures were adopted by the Association at the late meeting of its representatives in Newport. These are very simple and sure remedies. The office-seeking fever will wonderfully cool off when the aspirant knows that no political service, no Congressman's nomination, and no neighbor's signature will aid his ambition, and realizes that he must win by fair examination and pre-eminent qualification.

The Divine Law as to Wines; Established by the Testimony of Sages, Physicians, and Legislators against the Use of Fermented and Intoxicating Wines; confirmed by their Provision of Unfermented Wines to be used for Medicinal and Sacramental Purposes. By G. W. Samson, D.D., former President of Columbian University, Washington, D. C. 12mo, pp. 326. New York: National Temperance Society and Publication House. 1880.

If Dr. Samson had left the stiff word "Law" out, and had called his book what it is, a history—*A history of the wine battle through all lands and ages*—he would have presented a much more inviting title and won more readers. His style, too, is often slightly stiff, giving the impression of the pedantic, and unsuitable to the pop-

ular purpose of his volume. But these are slight disparagements. He does give a very interesting survey of the historic field of the moral war against alcohol, waged by the wise and good from the dawn to the present day, through all the recorded nations of the earth. Appetite has cried *Give! give!* and wisdom has cried *Withhold! withhold!* The drunkard, the moderate drinker, and the total abstainer, each has a pedigree that stretches back to the flood. And the advancing ages diminish not the heat of the battle or the danger of the result. Alcoholism is as fatal to civilized as to savage life. Wealth and refinement bring on luxuries and the wondrously delicate mixtures that infuse fascination into the cup of death. Art, guided by science, strengthens the alcoholic proportions of the draught, and aims a deadlier poison as well as a deeper attraction to the destroyer of mind, life, and soul. Never were its organized forces so great as now, never its threats so full of power and fatality. Mr. Parton is not far from right when he says the human race is on probation; and that it is a most serious question whether human existence is not to be drowned in the bottomless, burning hell of alcohol.

There have been, as Dr. Samson fully shows, three methods by which the wise and good have endeavored to restrain and prevent the ravages of the alcoholic curse. These are *dilution*, the remedy of the "moderate drinker;" *unfermented grape juice*, the divine method of pure nature; and *total abstinence*, the method of the purist and the reformer. The Egyptian priests appear to have been total abstainers, and they prohibited to their kings all but *the unfermented grape juice*. The apparatuses by which the Egyptian people strained out the pure juice are still preserved in picture. The three or four methods by which this preservation of the unfermented juice was attained are amply furnished in the Greek and Latin classics. And this unfermented juice was called *wine*. It was expressly and repeatedly called *wine* by so great a master of Greek as Aristotle, not "by courtesy," as Dr. Crosby unwisely imagines, but as its true, generic name. The very words by which the unfermented wine was designated in both Greek and Latin, namely, *gleukos* and *mustum*, are adjectives with the word *wine* understood. By long use, indicating the protracted popular existence of the unfermented article, the adjective degenerated into a noun, until the implication of the word *wine* was popularly forgotten. And now our learned missionaries duly report from the East that the *must* is never called *wine!* And then some of our home divines, as Dr. Crosby and

Dr. Hodge, with a very dynamic emphasis proclaim that alcohol is a necessary element in the communion cup!

Among the holy sages and saints of various ages purity from alcohol was a sacred maxim. The Egyptian priest, the Brahman, the Nazarite, the Spartan, all were pure. And the purest of sacred rites were *wineless*, even among those we are accustomed to call *heathen*. Both Æschylus and Sophocles represent the offerers as bringing *wineless* oblations to the holy gods. The Grecian offerers to the Sun, Athenæus tells us, presented libations not of wine but honey, since the pure Sun has no affinity with drunkenness. Others offered wine only to evil deities. The wine at the Passover came not from the divine Law, but from the vinous Rabbies, but even they prescribed dilution. And it is from these Rabbies alone that our Cyclopedist, noticed on another page, draws the conclusion that Jesus drank a paschal alcohol. All the four narrations of the sacred supper say that the cup contained simply the *offspring of the vine*, which alcohol is not. And the following testimony, given by Dr. Samson, indicates that however obedient the Christian disciples of these Rabbies are, or hold Jesus to have been, their Jewish disciples set the rabbinical rule at defiance:

In visits to the synagogues of Cairo, Jerusalem, and other Oriental cities, in inquiries at Washington, D. C., from eminent Rabbies resident in the East, as far as Bagdad, and in familiar acquaintance with Rabbies and merchants who are Israelites in New York, the writer has found one universal testimony, that *conformity to the law requires abstinence, if possible, from fermented wines at the Passover.* In the metropolitan city of the New World, where representatives of every Hebrew community and sect are met, the Passover wine is prepared from crushed raisins or dried grapes, steeped in water, pressed, and made into a sweet but unfermented wine.—P. 188.

Miscellaneous.

Lectures in Defense of the Christian Faith. By Professor F. Godet, author of "Commentaries on St. Luke, St. John, and Romans," etc. Translated by N. H. Lyttelton, M.A., Rector of Hadley and Canon of Gloucester. 12mo, pp. 348. Edinburgh: T. T. Clark. 1881. [Scribner & Welford's Imported Edition. Price $2 50.]

The genius of Godet appears at its best in these "Lectures," shedding fresh light and luster on old questions and topics. We hope to express our appreciation at fuller length in a future Quarterly.

Shakespeare's Tragedy of Cymbeline. Edited with notes, by William J. Rolfe, A.M., formerly Head Master of the High School, Cambridge, Mass. With Engravings. 12mo, pp. 231. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

Shakespeare's The Comedy of Errors. Edited, with notes, by WILLIAM J. ROLFE, A.M., formerly Head Master of the High School, Cambridge, Mass. With Engravings. 12mo, pp. 153. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

Landor. By SIDNEY COLVIN, A. M., Fellow of Trinity College and Slade Professor of Fine Art, Cambridge. 12mo, pp. 224. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

1 1 1 By GEORGE H. HEPWORTH, Author of "Starboard and Port," etc. 12mo, pp. 196. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

Byrne Emson's Building. By HILES C. PARDOE. Three Illustrations. 12mo, pp. 208. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1881.

Toby Tyler; or, Ten Weeks with a Circus. By JAMES OTIS. Illustrated. 12mo, pp. 265. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

Gerald. A Story of To-day. By EMMA LESLIE, Author of "Conrad," "Margarethe," "Saxby," "Walter," etc. Four Illustrations. 12mo, pp. 334. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1881.

Havilah. By Mrs. LUCY A. SPOTTSWOOD, Author of "The Fentons," and "Hugh Cheston's Vow." Four Illustrations. 12mo, pp. 262. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1881.

Wordsworth. By F. W. H. MYERS. 12mo, pp. 182. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

Farm Festivals. By Will Carleton, Author of "Farm Ballads." "Farm Legends," etc. Illustrated. 12mo, pp. 151. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

The Foreigner in China. By L. M. WHEELER, D.D. With an Introduction by Prof. W. C. SAWYER, Ph.D. 12mo, pp. 268. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1881.

The Westminster Confession of Faith. With Introduction and Notes by Rev. JOHN MACPHERSON, M.A., Findhorn. 12mo, pp. 168. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1881.

Thomas Carlyle. By MONCURE D. CONWAY. Illustrated. 12mo, pp. 255. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

Beauty in Dress. By Miss OAKEY. 12mo, pp. 196. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

Revised Odd-fellowship Illustrated. The Complete Revised Ritual of the Lodge and Encampment, and the Rebekah Degree. Profusely Illustrated. With an Historical Sketch of the Order, and an Introduction and Critical Analysis of the Character of each Degree. By President J. BLANCHARD, of Wheaton College, and Foot-note Quotations from Standard Authorities of the Order, showing its Character and Teachings. 12mo, pp. 281. Chicago: Ezra A. Cook. 1881.

The Beautiful Wretch. A Brighton Story. By WILLIAM BLACK, Author of "Sunrise," "A Princess of Thule," "Macleod of Dare," "The Strange Adventures of a Phæton," etc. Illustrated. 12mo, pp. 240. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

The Incarnate Saviour. A Life of Jesus Christ. By Rev. W. R. NICOLL, M. A., Kelso, Scotland. 12mo, pp. 356. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1881.

The Holy Bible According to the Authorized Version, (A.D. 1611.) With an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. COOK, A. M., Canon of Exeter, Late Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. New Testament, Vol. III, Romans to Philemon. 8vo, pp. 544. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons. 1881.

INDEX.

Abolitionism ..... Page 270, 474
Adam, Natural Headship of 752
Africa, South, Bassuto Mission 307
Expedition of 769
Alaska, The Territory of 405
Description of, by Hubert H. Bancroft 406
Seward censured for purchase of .. 406
Importance of Alaska 407
Policy of Russia in selling Alaska 408
Climate, Resources, and Population ... 409
Thirty Thousand Souls in need of the Gospel 420
Religion and Character 416
American Cath. Quar. Review 144, 339, 742
American Reviews 144, 339, 537, 739
Amœba, lowest form of animal life 553
Anabaptists 709
Anecdotes of Phineas Rice's Preaching 543
Angels 568
Animal Life, Lowest Form, Amœba 553
Anti-Semitic Persecutions 556
Antislavery Movement, American, Churches and Mr. Garrison 270, 474
Apocrypha, (The Old Testament.) Christianity not independent of Judaism 77
I Esdras, II Esdras 80
Tobit and Judith 82, 83
Additions to Esther and Daniel 85, 86
The Prayer of Manasseh 87
The Wisdom of Solomon 88
Ecclesiasticus and Baruch 90, 92
Epistle of Jeremiah 92
The Book of Maccabees 93
The Question of Canonicity 97
Deutero-Canonical Character 99
Criticism and Literature 101
Argyle, Duke of, quoted 152, 154
Atheism of the Day, Professedly Pious 154
Atheism 155
Atonement 733
Aurbach: Evangelical Church in Germany.. 770
Authorship of Fourth Gospel 178

Baird's "Rise of the Huguenots" 103
"Ballot, a free and a fair count" 157
Bancroft's Native Races, etc. 405
Baptism, Taylor's Letters to Quaker 403
Baptist Review 144, 339, 537, 752
Barrande, on Derivation of Species 160
Bassutos, French Mission among 307
Beet's Commentary on Romans 385
Benrath, on the Italian Reformation 109
Bible, disbelief of 745
Higher Criticism and 375
Genesis 376, 544, 562, 756
In Pictures, Schnorr's 558
Italian Translations of 170
New Testament, Meyer's 384
Pentateuch 795
Poems descriptive of 399
Romans 385
Romans, Godet's 574
Revised N. T. 560, 740, 750
Revisions, Corcoran 743
Story, Rombelt's, Illustrated 557
Bibles, The Old. The Hebrew Bible distinguished among them ..... Page 231
Why God selected Abraham from whom the Promised Redeemer should come 242
Biblical Criticism 772
Bibliotheca Sacra 144, 544, 739
Böhl, Ancient Christian Inscriptions 758
Bose, Ram Chander. Hindu Eclecticism .. 605
Botany 551
Boutwell on "free ballot and free count" ... 157
Boyce's Higher Criticism and the Bible 375
Brédif's Political Eloquence in Greece 600
Bridel, History of Philosophy 763
British and For'n Evang'l Review. 162, 357, 753
British Quarterly Review 162, 357, 547, 757
Brown, J. Baldwin, on Pious Atheism 154
Brotherhood of Men 569
Buttz, H. A., Revised Version of New Testament 715

Cæsar 586
Caird's Philosophy of Religion 162
Calaveras' Skull, Prof. Whitney's 588
Calderwood's Science and Religion 581
Calvinism 752
Carey's Circumstantial Evidences of Christianity 569
Characteristics of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century 246
Literature, Characteristic Features of the Century 247
First. Characteristic. A tendency to exalt logical reason at the expense of the intuitions 247
Second. Superficiality of thought 248
Third. Superficial political discussion 250
Fourth. The thought of the century, critical and destructive philosophy ... 251
Carlyle, Thomas, Reminiscences ... 547, 549, 584
Chamberlain's History of the Bible 560
Chambers, New Bible Revision 740
Cheever's Faith, Doubt, and Evidence. ... 782
Chemistry, Religion and 575
Chinese Education, Philosophy, Letters 604
In America, Gibson's 28
Question, Miller's 28
Choice, The Freedom of, J. Miley 434
Christ 567, 569
Christ and our Century, A. A. Lipscomb .. 635
Christ and Man, same relations 658
Christ furnished a typical manhood 659
Skepticism result of Materialism 664
Criticisms of Froude 666
Ruskin 667
Christian Art Monuments, Italy 401
Christian Doctrine, Hagenbach's 387
Church Building in Middle Ages 579
Churches and Slavery 270, 474
Cicero 588
Civil Service Reform 790
Clarke, J. F., Shakespeare and Bacon 356
Clark's Wesley Memorial Volume 180, 501
Codex of Matthew and Mark 601
Collin's Old Times in the Colonies 185
Collingy, Admiral, Character of 127

Congregationalism, Its Place in History and Literature, J. F. Hurst.....Page 286
Plymouth Colonists in 1620. The Oldest Religious Elements in this permanent American life..... 287
Separation from the Church of England 292
Flight to Holland 296
John Robinson..... 298
Progress of Congregationalism..... 301
Declaration of General Court of Massachusetts in 1621..... 303
Conscience, Amelia de Lassaulx..... 171
Contemporary Review..... ...151, 154, 555
Convent Schools in Belgium..... 554
Cooke's Religion and Chemistry..... 575
Corcoran, Bible Revisions..... 748
Crimea, Invasion of, Kinglake's..... 391
Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly...144, 537
Cyclopedia, Herzog's, German, New Edition 373
Cyclopedia, M'C. & S., Vol. X, S-Z..... 780

Dall's Alaska 405
Dall's North American Ethnology..... 405
Daniel, Book of, Genuineness of..... 145
First Attack on, by Porphyry..... 145
Recent discoveries indorse the book... 148
Daniels' Memorials of Gilbert Haven 392
Darwin, on Plant Action..... 551
Darwinism..... ...197, 571, 753
Dawkins' Early Man in Britain 205
Dawson, Notices, Barrande on Species..... 160
Dawson's Chain of Life in Geological Time. 183
Dean's Gibbon's Roman Empire..... 188
Degeneration in Nature 753
De Hass, "Bible Lands," notice of, by Universalist Quarterly, quoted..... 151
Dehtzsch mentally hears J. Smith..... 748
Dehtzsch, Messianic Prophecies..... 181
Demosthenes..... 609
De Stael, Madame 787
Dexter's Congregationalism, etc..... 286
Diman's Theistic Argument 776
Divorce and Marriage, Roedenberg on 362
Doctrine, Christian, Hagenbach's..... 887
Doggett, Sermons by..... 787
Dorchester's Problem of Religious Progress 785
Dorner, on Hartmann's Pessimism 165
Dorne's Christian Doctrine..... 769
Dunn's Angels of God..... 568
Durfee's Index to Harper's Magazine..... 600

Eaton's "Spoils" System, etc..... 790
Ebers' Palestine in Pen and Picture..... 769
Edinburgh Review 857, 549, 757
Education, Popular, the Genius of American Institutions, B. Hawley..... 635
Justin S. Morrell in U. S. Senate..... 636
Barnside's Bill in Congress 637
Early History..... 639
Times of the Reformation..... 639
Harvard, Yale, William and Mary College..... 640
Mass. and New York in early times. .. 643
Public Libraries..... 644
Presbyterian Church..... 644
Columbia College established..... 644
Methodist Discipline..... 645
Common Schools..... 650
Religion and Schools..... 651
Tourgee's plan 653
Convent, in Belgium 554
Egyptian Agriculture, Ancient Thaer..... 770
Elements of the Lord's Supper..... 604
English Reviews 162, 857, 541, 753
English Style and Spelling..... 361
English Thought in the Eighteenth Century, Some Characteristics of..... 246
Ethics, Natural, Savage..... 745
"Evidences"..... ...569, 570
Evidences..... 784

Faith and Infidelity in Germany.....Page 128
Faith, Doubt, and Evidence..... 784
Fiji, King and People of..... 721
Fisch, Pastor..... 767
Fitzgerald's George the Fourth..... 592
Foreign Literary Intelligence..... 378, 557, 769
Foreign Religious Intelligence..175, 370, 554, 765
Foster's Cyclopedia of Poetry, 2d series.... 599
Fox, A. J., Shakespeare: His Genius and Times 623
Fradenburgh, J. N., Zoroaster and Zoroastrianism..... 61
Freedmen..... 561
Freedmen's Aid Society, 1880 382
Freedom of Choice..... 234
French Protestant Literature, Recent, 760, 762
Protestantism, Recent..... 760, 762, 767
Reviews..... ...171, 367, 762
Froude's Cæsar: A Sketch..... 786
Froude's Carlyle's Reminiscences..... 584

Garrison, William Lloyd..... 270, 474
Geikie's Hours with the Bible..... 562, 784
Geological..... 738
Geological Record, Unbroken..... 182
George, A. C., Pan Presbyterian Council.. 45
George the Fourth, Life of..... 592
Gerhardt und Hatnack, Codex..... 641
German Empire, Aurbach, Evangelical Church in 770
German Methodism: Its Hopes and Dangers 461
Jacob Albright as Missionary..... 464
Marvelous Growth of Ger. Methodism. 465
Financial Statement..... 466
Success of Sunday-school work in..... 467
Successful educational interests in..... 468
The German language and literature ... 471
Lutheran against..... 473
German Philosophy 812
German Reviews..... ...165, 362, 758
German Ultramontanes..... 555
Germany..... 899
Phases of the Conflict Between Faith and Infidelity, in 128
Gibson's Chinese in America..... 28
Mosaic Era..... 705
Pastoral Days..... 202
Given's Truth of Scripture Revelation, Inspiration, and the Canon..... 805
God, Unity of, and of Nature..... 340
Godet's Lectures, Christian Faith..... 796
Gooding, W. L., Hermann Lotze..... 352
Gospels, The Four, Gregory's..... 835
Greece, Political Eloquence in..... 640
Greek New Testament..... 796
Gregory's The Four Gospels..... 835
Guth, G., Our German Methodism: Its Hopes and Dangers..... 461

Hagenbach's History of Christian Doctrine Vol. II..... 887
Hamline, Life and Works of..... 5
Early Ministry and Editorial Life..... 10
Ladies' Repository..... 11
Elected Bishop..... 16
Resignation 26
Last Days..... 27
Hanson, A. G., Our Pacific Coast Problem 28
Harper's Magazine, Index to..... 600
Hartmann, Life and Works of 165
Haug's Religion of the Parsis..... 61
Haven, Gilbert, Daniels'..... 392
Hayes, President, Message..... 129
Haygood's Our Brother in Black..... 194
Haygood's Platform for South 194
Henning, G. W., The Old Bibles, The Hebrew Bible Distinguished among them 741
"Hereditary Guilt," Doctrine of..... 573
Herzog's Cyclopedia, new edition..... 373
Hilgenfeld on Marcion of Pontus..... 564

Hindu Eclecticism, Ram Chander Bose, Page 605
Bhagavad Gita, the Hindu Text-Book.. 607
What is Hindu Eclecticism?..... 607
Its Theology..... 612
Anthropology..... 616
Soteriology..... 619
Eschatology..... 621
History of Christian Doctrine..... 187, 387
Hodge, A. A., Vacant Churches, etc..... 740
Homer, Schliemann's Ilios..... 393
Houghton's At the Threshold..... 6 4
Huguenots, Baird's Rise of the..... 103
Margaret of Angouleme, Queen of Navarre..... 108
Calvin, born in 1509, youth, studies..... 110
Heresy, Punished with Death..... 112
First Protestant Church, 1555..... 113
The First National Synod of the Reformed Church, on May 26, 1559.... 113
History of French Protestantism..... 115
The name of "Huguenots"..... 115
Hunt's Religious Thought in England..... 246
Hurst, J. F., The Place of Congregationalism in History and Literature..... 286
Huxley's Hume, English Men of Letters.. 246
"Hymn and Prayer Book," Evangelical, Germany..... 559

Illiteracy, especially of the South..... 358
Illustrated Bible Story, Kunisch's..... 557
Indian Evangelical Review..... 357, 758
India, Russian Review on..... 771
Missions in..... 424
Infidelity..... 745
Faith and, in Germany..... 128
Inscriptions, Ancient Christian..... 758
Inspiration..... 566
Italian Reformation, Library on..... 159
Italy, Protestantism in..... 370

Jackson's Alaska and Missions..... 405
Jewish Question in Europe..... 541, 556, 765
Church, Old Testament Church..... 772
French Protestantism..... 767
Johnson's Christianity's Challenge..... 570
Journalism, American, Infidel in..... 543
European, Jew in..... 542

Kinglake's Invasion of the Crimea..... 391

Language, Science of, Savce's..... 387
Larned's Tales—Norse Grandmother..... 398
Lassaulx, Amelia de, Old Catholic..... 171
Lecky's History of England, etc..... 246
Lee, Bishop, mentally heard by son..... 749
Lefevre, Jacques..... 106
Guillaume Briçonnet, Bishop of Meaux. 107
"Liberalism"..... 786
Lichtenberger's Encyclopedie des Sciences Religieuses..... 193
Lipscomb, A. A., Christ and Our Century.. 655
London Quarterly Review..... 162, 357, 545, 773
Lord's Supper, Elements of, J. C. Hagey.... 694
Lossing's United States Navy..... 594
Lotze, Hermann..... 802
Philosophy of..... 817
Thoughts of God..... 822
Lutheran Quarterly..... 144, 340, 537
Lutherans against German Methodism..... 257
Lynch, Remsen County Vindicated..... 593

M'Clintock & Strong's Cyclo., Vol. X, S—Z.. 780
Macaulay, Miscellaneous Works of Lord..... 189
Macgregor's "Leaders" Criticised..... 379
M'Farlan, in Scotch Sermons, quoted..... 103
Man's Place in Time..... 245
Marcion of Pontus, Hilgenfeld on..... 804
Marriage and Divorce, Rodenberg on..... 562
Martin, The Chinese..... 604
Martineau, Harriet..... 839

Materialism, "Universalist Quarterly", Page 747
Matlack, Antislavery Struggle and Triumph in M. E. Church..... 552
Mental Phenomena, Singular..... 748, 749
Methodism, Carlyle on..... 586
Methodism, Edinburgh Review on..... 757
Methodism, German, in United States..... 403
Methodism, German Scholars on..... 769
Methodist Office-Bearer..... 571
Methodists, Sunday Service of..... 380
Meyer's Commentary on New Testament.. 386
Miller's Chinese Question..... 23
Ministers, Unemployed, Vacant Churches. 740
Minto's Defoe, (Eng. Men of Letters)..... 246
Mission, French, among Bassutos..... 367
Missions, Are Indian, a Failure?..... 424
Missions in Fiji..... 521
Morley's Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot..... 246
Morris' British Thoughts and Thinkers.... 185
Morris' Report on Alaska..... 405
Moxom, Natural Headship of Adam..... 752

Nagler, F. L.: Phases of the Conflict between Faith and Infidelity in Germany.. 123
Natural Ethics, Savage..... 745
Nature, Unity of, and of God..... 340
Naville, The Christ..... 569
Navy, United States, Story of..... 591
Neefey's Young Workers in the Church.... 570
New Englander..... 144, 340, 538, 739
New England Hist. and Gen. Register.. 144, 340
New Testament, Revised Version.. 560, 745, 750, 753, 796
In Original Greek..... 796
New York Times, quoted..... 749
Nicolls, The Incarnate Saviour..... 567
North American Review..... 157, 358, 537, 745
Norton, Church Building in Middle Ages... 579

Ocean Grove, President's Report..... 202
Old Catholic Church..... 175
Onahan, Romanist Colonization..... 742
Otheman, E. B.: Baird's "Rise of the Huguenots."..... 103

Paleontology, Researches of Barrande in... 160
Palmer's Life and Letters of Hamline..... 5
Pan-Presbyterian Council, A. C. George.... 45
Parsis, Haug's Religion of the..... 61
Pashitschke on African Exploration..... 769
Persians, Ancient..... 61
Pessimism, Hartmann's, Dorner on..... 165
Petroff's Report on Alaska..... 405
Philology, The Early Errors and Recent Progress of..... 670
History of the Discarded Philology.... 671
What is the Science of Comparative Philology?..... 671
Philosophy, History of, Bridel..... 703
Plant Movement, Mechanical..... 552
Poetry, Cyclopedias of..... 399
Politics, Aaron's Rod in, Tourgee..... 383
Popular Education the Genius of American Institutions..... 635
Potts' Golden Dawn..... 570
Potts' Methodist Office Bearer..... 571
Preachers, Great, Withrow's..... 403
Pre-Adamites: Wilson answers Winchell.. 598
Presbyterian Council, Pan-, A. C. George.. 45
Presbyterian Review..... 538, 739
Princeton Review..... 159, 340, 538, 739
Protestantism..... 786
Protestantism in Italy..... 370
Waldenses..... 370
Free Italian Church..... 371
Free Christian Church..... 371
Wesleyan Church..... 372
Methodist Episcopal Church..... 372
Baptists..... 372
Protestantism, Recent French..... 760

Quarterly Review, M. E. Church, South... Pages 548, 750
"Real Encyclopädie," Herzog's new edition. 373
Reformation, Italian..... 169
Relations of the Church and Mr. Garrison to the American Antislavery Movement .. 270
The Movement Sprang out of the Religious Sentiment of the People..... 271
Resurrection, "Beyond the Grave..... 484
Reusch's Die Deutschen Bischöfe und der Aberglaube..... 309
Reviews, German.....165, 332, 758
American.....144, 339, 537, 739
English.....162, 357, 541, 753
French..... 171, 367, 762
Revised Version of the New Testament.... 715
Presumptions in its favor..... 716
Acknowledged need..... 716
Competent authority and ability..... 716
Revue Chrétienne (Chris. Review)...171, 367, 762
Rice, Phineas, Anecdote of..... 543
Roedenberg on Marriage and Divorce..... 362
Roller on Tolerance..... 762
Romanism.....786, 554, 399
Romanist Colonization in West..... 742
Römheld's Illustrirte Biblische Geschichte.. 157
Russian Review..... 771

Sabbath Home Readings..... 201
Samson's Divine Law as to Wines..... 703
Sargent's Cyclopedia of Poetry..... 599
Savage, Natural Ethics..... 745
Sayce's Science of Languages..... 887
Schaff's Commentary on New Testament... 183
Schéels on Symbolics..... 771
Schliemann's Ilios..... 293
Schmid's Die Darwinis chew Theorien und ihre Stellung zur Philosophie, Religion und Moral..... 197
Schnorr's Bible in Pictures..... 558
Schultz's Archäologische Studien über Altchristliche Monumente..... 401
Science and Religion, Relations of..... 581
Scotch Sermons, Specimen by M'Farlan 162
Scott, "Are Indian Missions a Failure?"... 424
I. Direct Progress of the Native Church 424
II. Educational Advancement and Indirect influence of Indian Missions... 429
Ultimate Success of Missions..... 432
Scottish Rationalistic Movement..... 162
Sermons by Bishop Doggett..... 780
Serpent Tempter in Oriental Mythology.... 544
Servetus, Michael, H. Tollin on..... 364
Servetus, Michael, Trechsel on..... 759
Shakespeare, His Genius and Times..... 623
Theories as to his personality 625
His style 628
Skull, Prof. Whitney's Calaveras..... 538
Slavery and M. E. Church..... 582
Sledd, R. N., The Wesley Memorial Volume. 501
Smalley's Analysis and Formation of Latin Words..... 201
Smith's Old Testament in Jewish Church.. 772
Southall, J. C., Man's Place in Time..... 205
Species, Barrande on Derivation of..... 160
Species, Preservation of, by concealment... 158
Spelling, English, Reform coming..... 862
"Spoils" System, Eaton, Parton..... 790
Stanley's Christian Institutions..... 604
State Rights, Morgan..... 856
Stephen's Hist. of Eng. Thought, etc.. Page 246
Stephen's Johnston, (Eng. M. of L.)..... 246
Stevens' Madame De Staël..... 787
Stoughton's Religious in England, etc..... 246
Stuckenburg's Christian Sociology..... 186
Summers on Revised New Testament..... 709
Sunday Service of the Methodists in his Majesty's Dominions..... 380
Sunday Service of the Methodists in North America..... 380
Supreme Court, Partisanship in, Morgan... 856
Symbolics, Schéele..... 771
Symonds' Studies of the Greek Poets..... 188
Synopsis of the Quarterlies....144, 339, 537, 739

Taylor's Letters to a Quaker on Baptism 403
Temperance.....562, 744, 781
Tempter, Serpent, in Oriental Mythology.. 544
Terry, M. S., The Old Testament Apocrypha 17
Thaer, Ancient Egyptian Agriculture..... 779
Thakombau, Cannibal and Christian..... 823
Theistic Argument and Recent Theories... 776
Theological Course of Berlin 771
Theologische Studien und Kritiken..165, 362, 758
Theology, Dorner..... 769
Tolerance, Roller on..... 762
Tollin, H., on Michael Servetus..... 364
Tourgee, "Aaron's Rod in Politics"..... 855
Trechsel on Michael Servetus..... 759
Trollope's, A., Life of Cicero..... 588
Troy, Schliemann's Researches 293

"Unity of Nature," by Argyle, quoted ... 340
Universalist Quarterly.....145, 340, 548
Unsworth's Brotherhood of Men..... 569

Villars' Resurrection Life..... 784

Wallace's Island Life..... 571
Waterhouse's King and People of Fiji ... 821
Wesley Memorial Volume, The..... 501
Westcott's Greek New Testament..... 796
Westminster Review.....162, 547, 753
Wheeler's First Decade, W. F. M. S..... 744
Whitney's Auriferous Gravels, etc..... 205
Whymper's Travel in Alaska..... 405
Will, Edwards, Whedon and Hodge on.... 184
Will, Freedom of Choice..... 184
Winchell's Pre-Adamites..... 205
Winchester, Prof., Some Characteristics of English Thought in Eighteenth Century. 246
Wine Bottle, History of..... 723
Wine, Communion, Presbyterian..... 740
Wine, two kinds in Egypt 562
Wines, M'Clintock & Strong's Cyclopædia on 785
Wise, D., The Territory of Alaska..... 405
Withrow's Great Preachers, Ancient and Modern..... 488
Woman's Foreign Missionary Society..... 750
Workers, Young, in the Church..... 179

Year of Week, A..... 196
Young Christians, Talks with..... 604

Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, (Journal for Church History).....165, 760
Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie (Journal for Scientific Theology)..... 361
Zoology..... 253
Zoroaster and Zoroastrianism, J. A. Fredenburgh..... 61

4639 6